

# Baconiana.

VOL. VI.—*New Series.* OCTOBER, 1898.

No. 24.

## A PAPER ON THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF THE BACONIAN AUTHORSHIP OF SHAKESPEARE.

BY PERCY W. AMES, F.S.A.

*Read at a Meeting of the Bacon Society, May 24th, 1898.*

AFTER reading the numerous reviews, notes, suggestions, and forcible arguments contained in the two volumes of the *Journal of the Bacon Society*, and the brilliant papers by Mrs. Henry Pott, Dr. Theobald, Mr. George Stronach, and Mr. Alaric Alfred Watts; and further, after studying Mrs. Pott's edition of the *Promus*, Mr. William H. Smith's "*Bacon and Shakspeare*"; Mr. Appleton Morgan's "*The Shakespeare Myth*," and Mr. Edwin Reed's admirable presentation of the whole case in his "*Bacon v. Shakspeare*," it seems unnecessary and somewhat presumptuous again to bring forward the question in an elementary form. The justification, if any, is to be found in the fact that the arguments remain unanswered and may be universally ignored if fresh attention is not from time to time drawn to them. It only remains for me, with this apologetic note, to express my personal indebtedness to my accomplished friends in bringing the results of their labours before you.

In the present paper I propose to present for your consideration a few facts, collected from various sources out of a much larger number of the same kind, which have an important bearing on the question of the authorship of *Shakespeare*. They may be suitably prefaced by some observations on the nature of evidence. Evidence has been defined as the means of proving an unknown or disputed fact. Two significations of it are to be distinguished; one involving testimony as to the existence of facts, the other denoting relevancy to an issue. Research, discrimination, and the free exercise of an unhampered judgment are needed for the collection and valuation of evidence in the present enquiry. In ordinary cases evidence is derived from the mouths of witnesses, or from written testimony, but oral or parol evidence is of course not available for the settlement of historical problems which

depend for their solution entirely upon documents. All statements which can by any means be admitted as relevant to any enquiry, whether obtained from oral testimony or from inscribed records, belong to one or other of two kinds of evidence, *direct* or *circumstantial*. If positive proof from satisfactory direct evidence is not forthcoming the doctrine of presumptions must be resorted to, and this is founded upon circumstantial evidence. It is generally regarded as an occasion of weakness to Baconians, and is certainly one of scorn to their opponents, that direct evidence in favour of Bacon's authorship of *Shakespeare* is wanting. It is tacitly assumed that direct testimony is in its nature reliable and satisfactory, and that circumstantial evidence is necessarily weak and inconclusive, but this is a delusion. In courts of law, where some hold can be maintained over the witnesses, direct evidence is to be preferred, but it should always be remembered that direct evidence, whether oral or written, is liable to certain defects. The witnesses may be mistaken in their judgment; they may have been deceived by interested persons; or they may be deliberately false. On the other hand, "circumstances cannot lie," and if they are numerous and all point to one and the same conclusion they may be regarded as morally satisfactory as grounds of assurance and judgment. It is easy, therefore, to exaggerate the disadvantages occasioned by the absence of direct evidence, while we must acknowledge that the deficiency in this particular case has enormously stimulated research amongst ardent Baconians. The latter naturally maintain that where not one or two but a considerable number of independent and isolated as well as connected and continuous facts are to be found, explainable on one hypothesis only, it is irrational not to accept their obvious lesson.

Let us suppose that the Shakespeare Plays, which appeared for some years at first without any author's name on the title page, had continued to be anonymous to the end, and that the problem of discovering the concealed author was left for solution to our own day. This is not asking a very extravagant supposition, for the connection of W. Shakspeare with the plays is indeed of the slightest. After certain anonymous issues, his name appeared on the title pages, as it did on several other works not admitted in the Shakespearean canon, but in this circumstance his connection with the authorship begins and ends. The Plays began to appear before Shakspeare left Stratford, and new ones appeared and old ones were altered and revised several years after he was dead. The presence of a man's name on the title page of a book might be regarded as an item of presumptive evidence that he was the author, were it not for the fact that so



many writers in former times put down any name rather than their own. The explanation of this curious custom is to be sought in the different conditions of the then literary world. There were many disadvantages and some dangers attendant upon unrestrained freedom of speech, and at the same time fewer inducements to seek a literary reputation. There were neither dining clubs nor newspapers to fête and lionize a popular writer. If, therefore, this one fact of the use of Shakspeare's name on the title pages be ignored, we may ask are there any facts in existence that would lead any student to-day to advance his claim to the authorship? Let us give this question the attention its importance deserves. In the year 1780 George Steevens wrote as follows: "All that is known with any degree of certainty concerning Shakspeare is—that he was born at Stratford-upon-Avon—married and had children there—went to London, where he commenced actor and wrote poems and plays—returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried." The meagreness of this summary of the life of the greatest genius in English literature was regarded as almost a scandal, and during the last hundred years an unparalleled amount of research has been devoted to the study of Shakspeare's life with the object of obtaining some knowledge of the interesting processes of informing, developing, and moulding the genius of the author of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *Lear*. It was justly felt that the author of these Plays must have had a great and imposing personality, that could no more be hidden from the eyes of men than could the sunshine of heaven, and consequently signs of its influence were confidently sought. It was not unreasonable to expect to find letters addressed to the poet expressing warm admiration for his genius, and devotion to his person; letters addressed to other persons referring to Shakspeare in like terms of eulogy and affection; contemporary testimony as to the irrepressible nature of his wit, and the magical charm of the eloquence of the author of Mark Antony's oration, and the brilliancy of his conversational powers. It was also naturally believed that the genius behind these plays could not possibly have exhausted itself in their production, but must have poured itself out in many literary forms, and on such subjects as are there treated incidentally but with a wealth of learning, original conception, and brilliant idea; I mean the subjects of history, philosophy, jurisprudence, natural science, music, heraldry, etc. All these expectations were, however, doomed to disappointment. The only additions we can make to George Steevens' slender list of "what can be known with certainty" are such details as that he purchased property, dealt in malt, sold stone to the corporation, loaned money on

interest, prosecuted poor debtors, favoured a conspiracy to enclose public lands at Stratford and received a remonstrance from the Town Council in consequence. The references made to Shakspeare personally during his lifetime are the reverse of complimentary, and the effect on the reader's mind by the contemplation of the unattractive record has been thus expressed: "There is not recorded of him one noble or lovable action" (Thomas Davidson). "An obscure and profane life" (Emerson). "Whether Bacon wrote the wonderful plays or not, I am quite sure the man Shakspeare neither did nor could" (John G. Whittier). "I would not be surprised to find myself ranged with Mrs. Pott and Judge Holmes on the side of the philosopher against the play-actor" (Oliver Wendell Holmes).

The first set of circumstances for us to notice, therefore, are those which tend to disprove W. Shakspeare's authorship, and they are necessarily negative in character. Neither Shakspeare nor any of his family ever claimed that he was either author or owner of the plays. Everything we know of Shakspeare shows that he valued money, position, and social reputation. His fortune, equivalent to £4,000 a year of our money, had been made chiefly at the theatres, where many of these plays had been produced, yet in his will, although he specifies "houses, lands, messuages, orchards, gardens, wearing apparel, furniture, a sword, a silver and gilt punch-bowl, a second best bed," no books are mentioned, nor any manuscripts of unpublished plays. "It is simply silly to talk, as the commentators will," says Appleton Morgan, "of Shakspeare's omitting to mention them in his testaments because his copyrights had expired, or because he or his representatives had sold them to the Globe Theatre or to any other purchaser, except by registry of later date. The record of alienation could have been made in but one place, and it was never made there." Objectors to the Baconian theory sometimes say that it is impossible to believe that anyone could have written the plays and then abstained from claiming them; that any author could have been so indifferent to such creations of his brain, and to the fame of their authorship. They forget that if Shakspeare was the author, he exhibited precisely this indifference. If Bacon were the author, it was natural and necessary that he should conceal the fact. This matter is so well expressed in the *Algemeine Zeitung*, that I quote the passage in full. "The question why Bacon, if he were the composer of the plays, did not acknowledge the authorship is not difficult to answer. His birth, his position, and his ambition forbade him, the nephew of Lord Burleigh, the future Lord Chancellor of England, to put his name on a play-bill. In the interests of his family and of his



political career, the secret must be so strictly preserved that mere anonymity would not be sufficient. A live man-of-straw, a responsible official representative known to everyone, was required. No person could be better fitted for such a purpose than an actor, wise enough to understand and appreciate what was to his own advantage. Perhaps this Johannes Factotum of Greene's did not know the name of his benefactor. But even if he did know the name, it was obviously to his interest to keep from the world, and particularly from his gossiping companions, a secret which brought him money and fame." Bacon's reasons for continued concealment in later life can be easily comprehended when the man himself begins to be understood. In the introduction to one of his books unpublished at the time of his death, he wrote as follows:—"For myself, my heart is not set upon any of those things which depend on external accidents. I am not hunting for fame, I have no desire to found a sect, after the fashion of the heresiarchs; and to look for any private gain from such an undertaking as this, I should consider both ridiculous and base. Enough for me the consciousness of well-deserving, and those real and effectual results with which fortune itself cannot interfere." "The ring of these words," says Mr. Edwin Reed, "three centuries have not dulled. They will ring through all time, for they are of pure gold." It is evident from a letter which Bacon wrote to Bishop Andrews, in 1622, that he was fully aware that his lighter writings would yield, as he said, "more lustre and reputation to my name than those other which I have in hand," but his chief ambition was to serve mankind by instructing them in better ways of thinking; in other words, he preferred the fame of a philosopher to that of a poet.

It would be gratifying if the Shakspearean controversialists, who waste so much time in "taunting with the licence of ink" the Baconian advocate, would favour the enquirer with some simple and satisfactory explanation of such circumstances as the following:—

I. Bacon and his brother Anthony had cause for resentment against their uncle, Lord Burleigh, who seemed not to appreciate his gifted nephews, and turned a deaf ear to their entreaties for advancement. *Hamlet*, which Nash refers to as a familiar play in 1589, and says that the famous soliloquy, "To be or not to be," had been a subject of declamation on the public stage since 1586, and may, therefore, have been written before Shakspeare had left Stratford, contains a clever satire on Lord Burleigh. A writer in "Notes and Queries" (January 31st, 1863) declares that "Polonius is not so much a satire as a portrait of Lord Burleigh," and concludes that Shakspeare had some prejudice against that

celebrated minister. There is a twofold difficulty here, on the assumption that Shakspeare was the author of *Hamlet*. It is very improbable that at that early date the Lord Treasurer could have incurred the displeasure of the Stratford youth, and it is quite incredible that Shakspeare could have been so perfectly familiar with the prolixity of style and mental characteristics of Burleigh. On the other hand, granting Bacon to have been the author, the matter becomes clear and interesting.

II. Sir Edward Coke was a rival of Bacon at the Court, in the profession of the law, and in *love*, both men being suitors for the hand of Lady Hatton; accordingly we find Coke lampooned in the plays. In Disraeli's *Curiosities of Literature* (II., 531), it is stated "Coke was exhibited on the stage in *Twelfth Night* for his ill usage of Raleigh," and Lewis Theobald, in 1733, cites the utterances of Sir Toby Belch as a proof of Shakspeare's detestation of Coke.

III. The dedications of the poems and plays have given rise to endless romantic guesses. With reference to the dedication of *Venus and Adonis* to the Earl of Southampton, Richard Grant White says, "In those days and long after, without some knowledge of his man, and some opportunity of judging how he would receive the compliment, a player would not have ventured to take such a liberty with the name of a nobleman." Bacon and Southampton were fellow-lodgers at Gray's Inn, and for many years adherents of Essex. The Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery, to whom the first collected edition of the plays was dedicated, were shareholders with Bacon in Lord Somers's ill-fated expedition to America. The W. H., to whom the Sonnets are addressed, is believed by many to be W. Herbert, and Bacon's poetical versions of the Psalms are addressed to his relative George Herbert. When *Venus and Adonis* was republished, after Bacon had become estranged and alienated from Lord Southampton, the dedication was omitted.

IV. The 1604 edition of *Hamlet* contains the lines addressed by the Prince of Denmark to his mother—

"Sense sure you have,  
Else could you not have motion."

But they were omitted in the folio 1623. An explanation of the passage and of the cause of its omission at the later date, can only be supplied by reference to the prose works of Bacon. It is given by Mr. Reed as follows: "*The Advancement of Learning* was published in 1605, the year after the quarto, but it contains



no repudiation of the ancient doctrine that everything that has motion has sense. Indeed, Bacon had a lingering opinion that the doctrine is true, even as applied to the planets in the influence which they were supposed to exercise over the affairs of men. But in 1623 he published a new edition of the 'Advancement' under the title of *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, and therein expressly declared that the doctrine is untrue; that there is motion in inanimate bodies without sense, but with what he called a kind of perception. The Shakespeare folio came out in the same year, and the passage in question, no longer harmonizing with the author's views, dropped out."

V. One of the many puzzling difficulties presented by the plays arises from the numerous and marvellously accurate descriptions of foreign scenes. Travellers familiar with those parts are the most convinced that the author wrote from personal and first-hand observation. We are well assured that Shakspeare never left this country, while Bacon spent several years in travel and study in France and Italy, the countries particularly described.

VI. However impersonal and objective a great writer may be, it will inevitably be found that his works reflect the places, circumstances, offices, prejudices, studies, rank, society, education, taste, etc., specially associated with his personal experiences. The plays known as Shakespeare are only an anomaly when the actor Shakspeare is assumed to be the author; they harmonize perfectly and in every detail with Bacon's authorship. They contain special references to the people of Kent, the county of Bacon's ancestry; they have nearly twenty references to St. Albans, where Bacon lived, but not one to Stratford-on-Avon. They reveal by technical terms an intimate acquaintance with life at the Universities, and the Inns of Court, which was not within Shakspeare's experience, while Bacon was a University man, and a member of the leading Inn of that age. They describe the provinces of France and the districts in Italy where Bacon and his brother travelled and lived, but where Shakspeare never set foot. They are remarkably deficient in accurate delineation of child-life, though Shakspeare had many children while Bacon was childless.

VII. The plays ceased to appear while Bacon was holding office, and reappear after his fall, when Shakspeare had been long dead.

VIII. At the beginning of the seventeenth century Bacon was in very heavy trouble. Essex had just been executed; Bacon's

beloved brother Anthony had just died, and his mother had fallen into a deplorable mental derangement. Curiously enough this corresponds with the universally admitted dark period of the dramatist's life, when the gloomy tragedies of *Macbeth* and *Lear* appeared. At this time, however, Shakspeare was rich and prosperous, was buying land, and bringing suits against debtors.

IX. A wonderful note-book has been discovered which we believe to have been prepared by, and for the use of, the author of the plays for the following reasons :—

(a) It contains 203 English proverbs copied out of Heywood's collection, of which 152 are found in Shakespeare.

(b) There are 240 Foreign proverbs, of which 150 occur in the plays.

(c) There are 225 phrases from Erasmus which are repeated in Shakespeare. The order in which they appear in the note-book is constructively followed in the plays, although it is not the same order as in Erasmus.

(d) Of the 1655 entries in the note-book a surprisingly large number are identical with expressions used in no other literature of the age except the plays and poems called Shakespeare. This unmistakeable common-place book for the plays, however, is in the handwriting of Francis Bacon and not in that of William Shakspeare.

X. The historical plays contain a remarkable series dealing with English History from the banishment of Hereford, son of John of Gaunt, to the birth of Elizabeth, with one curious gap; Richard the Second, Henry IV., Henry V., Henry VI., Edward IV., Edward V., Richard III., and Henry VIII. are all in the plays, but not Henry VII. Why the reign which united the Roses should have been omitted is a mystery until we turn again for explanation to Bacon. He fills up the gap by writing a history of Henry VII. in prose.

XI. The patient and industrious search for manuscripts, or any scrap of documentary evidence of William Shakspeare's connection with the plays was rewarded in rather a strange way in 1867. On the cover of a volume of manuscripts was written a table of contents which included the names of two of the Shakespeare plays, namely *Richard the Second* and *Richard the Third*, which plays, however, had been abstracted from the collection when it was discovered. The cover is "scribbled all



over with various words, letters, phrases, and scraps of verse in English and Latin, as if the copyist were merely trying his pen and writing down whatever first came into his head." Among the scribblings is the extraordinary word *Honorificabilitudino*, which with a different ending occurs in *Love's Labour's Lost*. Also the line from Lucrece "revealing day through every cranny peeps," and the name *William Shakespeare* eight or nine times over. Surely here is something which the advocates of William Shakspeare ought to make much of; independent documentary evidence associating his name with the titles of, and quotations from, the plays and poems. They do not speak of it, however, for the truth is that the manuscripts were Francis Bacon's, and, as Dr. Theobald says, "The only place in the world where we may be sure the manuscript of a Shakespeare play once existed is Bacon's portfolio."

XII. Several years after Shakspeare's death someone re-wrote portions of the plays and made considerable additions to them, and also produced half-a-dozen entirely new ones. The second and third parts of *Henry IV.* were first published in 1594 and 1595, under the titles, respectively, of the "First Part of the Contention between the two Famous Houses, York and Lancaster," and the "True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York." In 1619, three years after Shakspeare's death, they were republished under the same title as at first. In the folio of 1623, however, they appear under new titles and largely re-written. The second part now contains 1578 new lines, and is otherwise much altered. The *Merry Wives* was reprinted in 1619, in the same form as in 1602, but in the folio it is nearly twice as long as in the quartos. The prologue to *Troilus and Cressida* appeared for the first time in 1623. *Othello* first appeared in quarto form in 1622, six years after Shakspeare's death; and yet it received numerous and important emendations for the folio one year later. These most significant facts are to be found in a foot-note in *Bacon v. Shakspeare* by Edwin Reed.

It is maintained that such facts as these added to the argument afforded by the innumerable reflexions of Bacon's style, language, philosophy, sentiments, and habits of thought in the plays and poems, constitute a body of testimony as to his authorship which is irresistible. The unprejudiced and candid enquirer will notice in the so-called replies of the Shakspeareans an outpouring of abuse on the Baconians, a caricature of their method, an evasion of their arguments, a disdainful flavour throughout as if the writers regarded themselves as superior persons. The intelligent student will thereupon look into the

matter for himself, and we may safely trust to his reaching the truth.

Shakspeare has not only occupied the chief place in our respect and veneration, but he has also won his way into our affections, and this it is that makes his dethronement at once difficult and painful, even though our better judgment tells us he was only the mask for the real author. Those who have accepted the new theory have found two considerations facilitate this great transfer. First the reflexion that the love and reverence so prodigally given are not attributable to a single fact or circumstance connected with William Shakspeare, but all are excited by the qualities of the hidden Dramatist as seen in his works. Nothing can dethrone that literary monarch from his secure place. We Baconians cherish his memory in common with all Englishmen. Secondly, the real genius, character, and disposition of Francis Bacon, as revealed by his faithful biographer, Spedding, and as admitted by every unbiassed student, are such as to command precisely the same admiration and affection as we feel for the author of the plays. We can still speak of our Shakespeare, although with deeper feelings and with more rational sentiment, but when we wish to get behind these brilliant productions to have a glimpse of the actual author, we think not of the common-place bourgeois of Stratford, but of the poet and sage of St. Albans.

---

## CHIEFLY OF HIEROGLYPHIC SYMBOLS AND PICTURES AND THEIR USE.

**B**EFORE we plunge into the depths of our subject let one thing be made quite clear. It is not claimed for Francis Bacon (or for even his father Sir Nicholas) that he invented or was the originator of the system of hieroglyphics, symbols, and emblems which we are about to explain. Probably this system was adopted in mediæval times in connection with the Renaissance, or Revival of Learning, of which Dante seems to be regarded as the centre.\* Certainly in many illuminated manuscripts of a hundred years later date than the death of Dante, emblems are not only introduced, but repeated, in a manner which shows plainly that amongst a certain set of artists (all apparently connected with monastic and religious institutions), such symbols

\* Dante born 1265, died 1321.



were recognised as having a definite meaning. Amongst these are the five-petaled Rose, the Fleur-de-lis, Trefoil, Olive and Lotus Leaf, the Sun, Crescent Moon, and Orb, the Flaming Heart, Five-pointed Star, and other objects whose descent from the ancient mystical symbols of Egypt and India seems plain.

But, of such pre-Baconian symbolism, sufficient has been written, to excuse us from dwelling upon a tale already well told.\* Readers must expect, as with the histories of Printing and Paper Making, that all useful information (excepting as to the titles of books) will stop short at about 1540-50; and so indeed it does. If we wish for more, "Nay—an we get it, we shall get it by running"—and so with all due recognition of earlier efforts, our attention will, in the following pages, be focussed upon the growth and development of Symbolism and Parabolic illustrations as a method of teaching; and upon the special use and application of such things by Francis Bacon, and as part of his method.

No doubt Francis and his father Sir Nicholas were perfectly well acquainted with the "Little Book of Emblems" of the celebrated lawyer André Alciati, published in 1522,† and which is said to have "established, if it did not introduce, a new style for emblem literature, the classical, in the place of the simply grotesque and humorous, or of the heraldic and mythic."‡

Let us glance together at some of the Illustrations, Head-lines, Tail-pieces, and other decorative wood-cuts from the chief and best-known works of the 16th and 17th centuries; from the Bibles of 1583 to 1613, from various editions of the *Arcadia*, the *Fairie Queene*, from the works of *Drayton*, *Shakespeare*, *Ben Jonson*, *Cowley*, and a host of other authors, not only poets and dramatists, but also writers on Law, Physic, and Divinity, on History, Geography, Mathematics, and all manner of other subjects.

\* See especially as a guide to books which should be consulted the excellent work *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers*, by Henry Green, M.A. Lond.: Trübner & Co., 1870.

† Or said to have been then published. The Second Edition of 1531 is all that is now known to exist, and seeing the extraordinary tricks played in many other cases with dates and author's names, books post-dated and ante-dated, second editions of which no first can be found, we are inclined to be sceptical as to the tale that Alciati destroyed his first edition. Rather, we can well conceive that Sir Nicholas Bacon may have done as his more distinguished son did after him, *i.e.* published under the name of another.

The Little Emblem book was enormously augmented, and republished at Padua in 1621.

‡ Green, p. 69.

What is the first general impression given by these designs? Do they not suggest a general resemblance, as if one mind had invented, and one or two hands only had been engaged in their execution? On examining into details, we are presently surprised to find the constant return to certain particulars, there seems to be a want of originality, a continual harping upon the same set of ideas, yet at the same time we cannot but observe and admire the ingenuity with which these oft-repeated details are combined and re-combined, so as to produce from a few simple elements, an almost endless variety.

If resemblance is perceptible, and a common origin suspected, then—Who was the Designer? Who the Draughtsmen of these woodcuts?—Were they free agents, drawing their book-ornaments according to their own fancy, or did they design by order of some controlling power? And by what means did these peculiar patterns get into books so various, published by printers apparently disconnected, and in times and places so far apart?

Some of our illustrations are from books as early as 1580, others are more than a hundred years later.

“ But ”—(we echo explanations frequently offered)—“ you make too much of a simple matter ; no doubt these designs were *in the style of the day*. A few artists designed, and their wood-blocks were afterwards passed from hand to hand, and exchanged amongst the printers, so that the same designs were used over and over again in different works at different periods.”

We reply, what do you mean by *the style of the day* ? Like all things else, it must have had a cause. Where then was it bred ? Whence nourished ? On closer inspection we find that, although sometimes the blocks may have passed through the hands of different printers, yet, more often, the designs, at first supposed identical, are, like the Water-Marks, neither the same, nor from tracings, nor absolute copies—but the same “*with a difference*.” The difference is always of such a nature as to exclude the idea of chance, yet such as not to attract attention from the uninitiated, though by the initiated, to be instantly perceived. Sometimes circles, round spots, or other figures, are introduced into blank spaces, or one flower is changed for another, details are omitted, and other parts of the design adjusted to supply the deficiency, or whole sections will be cut from one picture and transferred to another, with other devices too numerous to specify in this place, but to be seen by any observer who will compare several examples of the same design.

But again, with regard to the statement that these designs were *in the style of the day*, we have to add that, so far as we have seen, they are only to be met with in books which (in certain



editions) have also some of a certain set of Water-Marks, and which, when the book containing them is well-bound, have, in the binding, certain tooled patterns, and other signs which we have learnt to identify with Freemasonry or Baconism. And these books, from other evidence, internal, and circumstantial, we have been led to associate with Bacon and his Secret Society long before we thought of prying into the paper, or collecting and analysing the wood-cuts.

To prove a negative is usually a difficult and thankless labour, but in this case inquirers may, without much trouble, satisfy themselves that the Book-ornaments in question were neither fortuitous in their occurrence, nor hap-hazard in their designs; that on the contrary, the group of pictures upon which our argument turns, are not only peculiar, and full of meaning, but, in a manner, *mysterious*, kept secret, so long as any suspicion or special interest was likely to attach to them.

It appears probable that the Freemasons (especially those connected with the Arts and Crafts of Printing and Engraving) are the Cause why any mystery should be made about this particular class of designs which we term "*Baconian*," and which certainly form part of a clue leading to Bacon, and to a recognition of his Works.

For it is provable that these Baconian Book-ornaments, these particular Head-lines and Tail-pieces, are excluded—rather, they have been *carefully eliminated*—from a gigantic collection of scraps at the British Museum, brought together to illustrate the arts of Printing and Engraving. The point is important, and the circumstances inexplicable, excepting on the assumption of the existence of a Society working *secretly* in the present day, in some respects just as it worked in "days dark and dangerous," three hundred years ago, when such devices and artifices for concealment were of the greatest use and necessity.

Sir Hans Sloane was the originator of the British Museum, for at his death he directed that his enormous collections—50,000 volumes of books, 3,566 manuscripts, and upwards of 30,000 preparations of specimens of natural objects—were to be offered to the nation for less than a fourth part of their value. Sir Hans Sloane was a physician, and a man of high scientific attainments, Fellow and President of the College of Physicians, Associate of the Academy of Sciences in Paris, Fellow, and by turns, Vice-President and President of the Royal Society. We may therefore, without further inquiry, rest satisfied that he was a Freemason.

Now when we find added to the Sloane collections, those other most precious collections known as the "*Harleian*," and the

"Cottonian" Libraries of Manuscripts, and the whole placed in a museum on the site of Montagu House, we begin to grasp one end of another of those chains which connect our present Libraries, Societies, and Great Institutions, Literary and Scientific, with Francis Bacon and his most intimate associates and friends. Those who found an institution have a perfect right to dictate the rules by which it is to be managed, and hence there is nothing strange in the fact that portions of such collections as we have named, should be put in trust, and only exhibited under certain restrictions—that in short, they should remain to some extent *Secret*. Doubtless the rule when made, was a wise and necessary rule, we can only regret that there appears to be now no ready means of rescinding it, that the whole matter should be inextricably interwoven with Freemason secrets, which (except perhaps by common consent) cannot be revealed without a wholesale breaking of vows or pledges.

The question readily arises—Why should a particular section of a Collection of Book-ornaments be, as a *Collection*, suppressed, kept in the background, and made difficult of access; "un-recorded," in short, in any public catalogue at the British Museum?

One solution of this riddle alone presents itself. A simultaneous exhibition of these designs, properly arranged and catalogued, must inevitably strike the eye, and bring to the mind of the most superficial observer, the fact that, from whatever source these woodcuts were collected—by twos or threes, from over the whole extent of English Literature—*All come from the works of Francis Bacon*, as so many rays from one luminary, and that it has been, for the last three hundred years, thought desirable to put that light under a bushel.

It was John Bagford who at the end of the 16th Century formed the huge Collection, destined, we are told, to be the basis of a complete History of Printing and kindred subjects; a work which, however, seems never to have been undertaken.

This Collection, which is unattainable in the ordinary way, (namely by means of the public printed Catalogues of the Library) may therefore be described as a *secret or reserved Collection*, known only to Freemason Printers, and to a select clique. It consists of 108 volumes, some with MSS. but the majority are Albums filled with pieces cut from books, and unexplained.

Amongst the tens of thousands of specimens torn from their homes and here buried alive, one remarkable group of designs is *absent*—those, namely, which adorn the pages of the Bible of 1583, of certain editions of the *Arcadia*, *Fairie Queene*, *Shakespeare*, *Ben Jonson*, *Cowley*, *Drayton*; of *Charles Butler*, *Peter Heylin*,



*Sir Walter Raleigh, Purchas, Evelyn*, and many other distinguished "Authors" during the space of 100 years.

Probably, as we shall show, these woodcuts once filled the many blank spaces in these scrap albums, where marks of gum bear witness to pieces having been removed; but (with a few notable exceptions), their place knows them no more, and the fact is significant. For observe, that we are here speaking of the *absence*, from an enormous Collection of woodcuts, of those very designs whose *presence*, in the most important works of the most important epoch in English literature, has been explained upon the assumption that *these designs were common to books of the period*. It is left to the reader's consideration, whether he would not reasonably expect to meet with the most notable woodcuts from the most notable books of the time, in the gigantic Collection of book-plates described by Mr. Leslie Stephen in his *Dictionary of National Biography*.

Whatever else may be proved by means of this "Bagford Collection," one point is clear—that its possessors or guardians have recognised the particular set of Book Plates to which we refer, *as a Class*, to which some peculiar interest attaches, and which must, for some cause, be kept secret; not allowed to be presented collectively to public view, or exposed, so as to attract public attention. The assemblage of many Title pages\* tells a good deal, but each Book and Title has its own lettering to vary the effect of the page, and the illustrations of the Title-pages are often seen to have a direct relation to the firm of Printers from which the book emanates. But who would not be startled at seeing many pages together of Head-lines or Tail-pieces, *at first sight identical*, from the *Bible* and from *Bartholomew Fair*, from *Du Moulin's Council of Trent*, *Howard's Court Comedies*, and *Bacon's History of Life and Death*?

The Custodians of the Collection have apparently taken this view of the case, and although abundant traces on the bereft pages, and numerous entries of past librarians attest the removal "to the portfolios of the Print Room" of a considerable number of these pieces, there is in the Print Room "no record" of their existence. *No record in writing*, that must mean, for nothing brought into the Libraries of the British Museum has been allowed to quit it, and doubtless any Freemason in possession of the proper password could obtain a sight of them.†

\* There are eight ponderous folios of "Bagford's Title pages" in the Large Room. They form a separate collection.

† Since the above was written we have discovered the unrecorded Collection. It may be seen in the Print Room, with the title "Miscellaneous Matters relative to printing, for collecting specimens of Blooming Letters." 10. 1866. 12. 8. 633-636. The book *has evidently* been much handled.

Sometimes, during the progress of researches into these Book ornaments and their history, we have heard them accounted for as "products of the Renaissance." Well-sounding words, one degree more satisfying than those which describe our woodcuts as in "the style of the day." Yet when we press for an explicit definition of "the Renaissance," it comes in so shadowy and questionable a shape as to be a mere ghost of an explanation. Let us, then, begin at the beginning, and inquire, "when did that Revival begin—of Art, Science, and Literature—which we associate with "the Renaissance"?

The Italian Revival of Learning, which took place about the time of Dante, is said by a competent authority to have consisted wholly, or mainly, of "that *resuscitation of Classical Literature and Art*, which exercised so potent an influence over the mind of Europe . . . and brought back the old *Mythology* which had previously intervened between the mind, and natural objects. This *Mythology* was no longer believed in. It appeared as mere machinery, and literary artifice."

This Sentence assures us that the aims of the Italian Renaissance were shorter, the scope far narrower, than those which Bacon set before him in the "New Birth of Time," which, to our own mind, was the *true Renaissance*.

Did Bacon desire that Mythology, Philosophy, Religion—anything—should "intervene" between the Mind of Man and Nature?

If so, it must intervene as the Ladder between Heaven and Earth, as the Golden Chain reaching to the foot of Jupiter, as the Mirror of the human mind reflecting from its surface the whole universe, opening and intelligencing—

"Between the sanctities of Heaven  
And our dull workings."†

But the great "Restauration" was not to be accomplished by literary artifice or even by *imitation*. "For a long space," says our authority, "Poets thought that they must imitate Virgil or Horace in their descriptions."

Those were their Hercules' Pillars, beyond which scarcely one dreamed of venturing. Their souls reached not to the discovery, invention, or advancement of anything—their utmost bourn was *imitation* of the great wits who preceded them, and of a *Mythology no longer believed in*.

But Bacon had no faith in the benefits derived from mere imitation, which he brands as "base" and "apish." "*Imitariis*

\* The Renaissance. Walter Pater.

† 2 Hen. IV., IV. ii.



*nothing*”—nothing, that is, except it bring some improvement, some advance, or further good to mankind.

It cannot be said that the first Renaissance was “nothing.” On the contrary, it was much to have revived a love of the classical writings of Greece and Rome, to have awakened remembrance of the great things done by them of old time, perhaps even to have inspired others to emulate them. But after all, this first Renaissance was practically for the learned only, not for the many-headed and ignorant multitude; for the rich, dilettanti, not for the unenlightened poor.

The books revived in this first struggle towards the light, were chiefly written in Latin, and closed the door to the uneducated masses, excluding all who had not the advantage of a classical training, and limiting their readers to members of the learned professions or to inmates of religious houses. Art, at this period, was chiefly religious, and from this religious art, the Rosicrucians, later on, seem to have borrowed some things, but *not* the designs of which we are speaking.

If, then, these designs are neither truly accounted for by attributing them to “the style of the day,” if they are not peculiar to one printer, nor always printed from the same blocks, nor from mere copies of the originals; if they can neither be truly defined as “common to books of the period,” nor as “products of the Renaissance,”—what are they? Who devised them? Have they any meaning? and if so, is that meaning still recognised, and insinuated or expressed, in the ornaments of modern books?

These questions have to be answered, and it is the object of these pages to give a little impetus to the inquiry, which will be found to drag after it a whole train of suggestions, inferences, theories, and to end perhaps in shaky conclusions. We write preparing to be tripped up, or to find that we have unwittingly run off the rails. But mishaps to a Pioneer engine count for little. “Experience is by industry achieved,” and when, by a few failures, the organisation has been perfected, future progress will be ensured. Let us, then, do the best we can to make a start, and where we break down, may others lend a hand to mend the matter—and go on again.

First, then, it seems safe to say of these designs that they are products of, and inseparable from that Revival of Learning which, germinating at the time of Francis Bacon’s birth, grew with his growth, and came to maturity and full bearing before his death.

Manifestly, also, these designs have a character peculiar to

\* *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, IV. iii.

themselves. They cannot accurately be described as "antique," "classical," "pseudo-Greek or Roman," "Mediæval," or "ecclesiastical;" they can neither be identified as Dutch, French, or Italian, and many of them appear at first sight to be so singularly inappropriate to the books in which they are found, as to give the impression that they must have been originally intended for some other work than that which they adorn, and that there is ground for the assumption that the printers used old blocks hap-hazard.

But set against this, that books in the 16th and 17th centuries were too scarce, too precious, to be treated cavalierly, and that the arts of wood-engraving and of ornamental design had attained great perfection in a generation previous to Francis Bacon; Italy for design, and Holland for execution, seem to have been pre-eminent.

The *Variations* (almost always for the worse) can only be estimated by comparing several specimens of each design, printed at different dates. It then becomes plain that as time went on and the arts of Printing and Engraving became perfected and more general, *these particular designs degenerated*, signally and with intention, until at length they were discarded.

Probably the deterioration was meant to impose upon careless observers as being the result merely of the wearing and gradual destruction of the block; we need but magnify and count the lines, or note their direction, especially in shaded portions of the drawings, to make sure that such explanations are fictitious.

Meanwhile, in proportion as one set of designs shows signs of departure, another set begins to appear with the same emblems, the same set of ideas differently rendered. Observe the details of both old and new designs. Sort out and catalogue for yourselves the items which compose them, and which occur over and over again, ringing the changes amongst themselves; you will find definable limits to the objects or details introduced.

Take, for instance, the Flowers; here are Roses, five-petaled, single and conventional, more rarely double; Moss Roses, never; Pinks often strangely rayed or patched black and white; Lilies of many natures, but no Lily of the Valley. There are Sunflowers, Anemonies and Daisies, but not the striking Ox-eyed Daisy; Poppies, too, and Thistles, Narcissus, Daffodil, Tulip, and some Bell-flower; but neither Primrose, Buttercup, Cowslip, Hyacinth, Heartease or Pansy, Violet, Forget-me-not, Corn-flower, Convolvulus, nor Orchid or any kind, nor trailing or creeping plant excepting the Honey-suckle, Vine and Ivy.

Wheat is seen (and perhaps Barley) but neither Oats, Rye nor any of the elegant and artistic grass tribe; Nuts and Acorns, but



no Hips and Haws, Mountain-Ash or Rowan berries, Dog-wood, nor even the picturesque and prickly Horse-chestnut.

Of Fruits, we have the Apple, Pear, Fig, Almond, Pomegranate and Grapes in abundance; but neither Orange, Lemon, Peach, Plum, Cherry nor Currants. The Palm branch, but never the fruits, and nothing that comes under the denomination of "berry" whether wild or cultivated. Neither Mulberry, Elder-berry, Gooseberry, Raspberry, Strawberry, Barberry, Ivy berry nor Holly berry.

Edible Roots and Vegetables are entirely absent; it may be said that they are not artistic or beautiful, yet Ceres might have condescended to place some in her Baskets and Horns of plenty, and for the matter of beauty, there is nothing essentially beautiful in a Pomegranate or a nut. A Carrot, with its feathery top, or a silver-green Onion may vie with either.

And turning to the animal world we find the Lion, Bear, Dog and Horse, and sometimes the horns of the Bull, and the head of the Panther, Boar, Hound, Goat or Ram; but neither Wolf, Tiger, Fox, Lynx, nor Cat; neither Elephant, Camel, Ass, Mule, nor other beasts of burden.

Rabbits and Squirrels are frequent, Hares less common, Porcupines occur in Title pages, but probably only in allusion to the Sidney family who bore a Porcupine as their crest. In the Head-lines are Stags, and other long-horned animals of the Deer tribe, but the young of all animals excepting Colts are absent, neither have we noted any example of the following:—Ape, Monkey, Marmoset, Otter, Beaver, Hedgehog, Rat, Mouse, Shrew, Bat.

And so we might continue through every department of Natural History—Birds, Reptiles, Fishes, Insects. In every case the same eclecticism—one taken, and another left. The designs may be as early at 1583, or as late as 1893, but in each and all, the elements which compose them are the same. The modern Freemason printers appear neither to have added to, nor taken from, the original code of emblems handed down to them by tradition (perhaps without their knowledge of the meaning) for at least three hundred years.

Mark, next, the difference between the *First* (Italian, or Dante) Renaissance,\* and the *Second* Revival, designated as Bacon's "New Birth of Time."—This was, like Bacon himself, nothing if not practical. Every effort was to be a step in advance, and a

\* The opinion has been already expressed that the Renaissance movement was started by Sir Nicholas Bacon and his friends, who established or got the control of the Paper Mills and Printing Presses at home and abroad.

step in time; for this was a true "march of intellect," the progress of an army of Red Cross Knights, destined to a long unending contest with Ignorance and Error—an army which "came not in single spies, but in battalions," and though starting from opposite quarters, all bending their steps to one point with the systematic order and good results so well described in *Henry the Fifth* (I. ii.).

"I this infer,—  
That many things having full reference  
To one consent, may live contrariously;  
As many arrows, loosed several ways,  
Come to one mark: as many ways meet in one town;  
As many fresh streams meet in one salt sea;  
As many lines close in the dial's centre;  
So may a thousand actions, once afoot,  
End in one purpose, and be all well-borne  
Without defeat,"\*

Not only was there to be Advancement in Learning, Co-operation, and a uniform Method and Aim, but the Baconian revivalists were not to be content with imitating, or even equalling, the Ancients, *they were to surpass them.*

Ben Jonson praises in almost identical words, first "*Shakespeare*" in poetry, then Bacon, in prose. Neither "insolent Greece nor haughty Rome," could be compared to *him* (Bacon or *Shakespeare*, as you like it). This sentiment is generally held to be Ben Jonson's own particular property. Not so, it is Bacon's, who, long before Ben Jonson's lines saw the light, challenged for modern literature and science, comparison with all that Greece and Rome had produced, prophesying triumph for the new philosophy and for the advance of learning.†

Lastly, we might draw arguments from a not inconsiderable number of forms which, having no apparent meaning, no inherent beauty, and being, indeed, almost indescribable, can only have been produced, and variously produced, in accordance with some rule, or mutual understanding amongst the artists, which we confess ourselves unable to fathom.

\*If we pass from objects of Natural History to Mythological objects and personages—the small number picked from the densely populated regions of pantheistic religions—and to a still small number of Biblical personages, the same principles of choice and rejection are seen to rule, all combining to produce certain details, and none other.

† See *Adv. L. ii.* To the King. Spedding iii. 335 and 340. *Filicen Labyrinth*: *ib.* iii. 499. *Nov. Org. Pref. ib.* p. 52-62, xxxi. lxi. lxii. *De Aug.* vi. i. *ib.* iv. 442, etc. See also "To the Reader"—5th Page, Bible 1611 Compare *Montaigne's Ess.* Cotton's Edn. ii. 404, etc.



Really, when we set to work upon these subjects, we ought first to make sure of what Bacon has to say about them. But experience shows that many will glance at this book and rush headlong into arguments and controversy upon the subjects which it includes, without having taken the trouble to read his works. It therefore seems well to make a few Extracts from that Chapter\* in which, beginning with the Art of Transmitting Discourse, of Hieroglyphics, and the Notations of Things, he proceeds through the divisions of Grammar, to "Poetry in respect of Metre," and thence to the doctrine concerning Ciphers and their reference to writing.

After drawing attention to *Gesture*, as a vehicle of thought, and to the Chinese characters, which represent neither letters nor words, but things and notions, he continues:—"The Notes of things then, which carry a signification without the help or intervention of words, are of two kinds: one . . . where the note has some congruity with the notion, the other . . . where it is agreed upon at pleasure. Of the former kind are Hieroglyphics and Gestures; of the latter the Real Characters above mentioned.

"The use of Hieroglyphics is very old, and held in a kind of reverence, especially among the Egyptians, a very ancient nation. So that they seem to have been a kind of earlier-born writing, and older than the very elements of letters, except perhaps among the Hebrews.

"Gestures are as transitory Hieroglyphics. For as uttered words fly away, but written words stand, so Hieroglyphics expressed in gestures, pass; but expressed in pictures, remain. For when Periander, being consulted with, how to preserve a tyranny, bade the messenger follow him, and went into his garden and topped the highest flowers, hinting at the cutting off of the nobility,† he made use of a Hieroglyphic just as much as if he had drawn it on paper.

\* *De Aug.* IV. 6. The close alliance in Bacon's mind between Hieroglyphics and Ciphers, as branches of the Arts of Discourse and Writing, and specifically of Poetry, ought not to be overlooked.

† There seems to be an allusion to this in the speech of King Edward.

"What valiant foemen, like to Autumn's corn,

Have we mow'd down, in tops of all their pride." (3 *Hen.* V. vii.).

"He in fury shall cut off the proudest conspirator." (*Tit. And.*, IV. iv.).

And of Humphrey Duke of Gloster "a limb lopped off . . . Thus droops this lofty pine, and hangs his sprays." (2 *Hen.* VI., II. iii., etc.).

The anecdote is related of Tarquin in Catiline iii. 5, and also in the Anonymous, "*Mercury, or the Secret and Swift Messenger*," a small cipher book which seems to be an abridgement, in Bacon's language, of the Latin *Gustavi Seleni Cryptographiæ*.

"In the mean time it is plain that Hieroglyphics and Gestures have always some similitude to the thing signified, and are a kind of emblems ; whence I have called them, "Notes of things by Congruity."

"Real Characters, on the other hand, have nothing emblematic in them, but are merely surds, no less than the elements of letters themselves, and are framed *ad placitum* and silently agreed on by custom."

"It is evident, however, that a vast multitude of them is wanted for writing ; for there ought to be as many of them as there are radical words. This portion therefore of the Doctrine of Discourse which relates to the notes of things, I set down as wanting. And although it may seem to be of no great use, since words, and writing by letters, are by far the most convenient organ of transmission, yet I thought good to make some mention of it here, as a thing not unworthy of consideration. For we are handling here the currency, so to speak, of things intellectual, and it is not amiss to know that as moneys may be made of gold and silver, so other Notes of Things may be coined besides words and letters."\*

Here Bacon stops, and gives no hint of why this deficient art requires to be taken in hand and improved. He does not say what it is that he proposes to transmit, but implies that it is something of great value, and necessitating secrecy. Otherwise why should not the knowledge be handed down, plainly and openly, by speech and writing ? But he adds that this portion of the Organ of Discourse, useful though it would be, is *wanting*. We are therefore struck with surprise to find Hieroglyphic pictures, or *Ciphers in Images*, described, and illustrated by examples, in the elaborate book of Cryptography by "Gustavus Selenus," already mentioned, and which was published in January, 1623, whereas the *De Augmentis* containing these remarks by Bacon on the deficiencies in Cipher Writing, and other methods for the transmission of knowledge, was not published until the following autumn. We leave readers to their own meditations and conclusions on this subject.

Another book (it is a very small one, and appears to be a kind of abbreviated edition of the large work of "Selenus") paraphrases, but still in thoroughly Baconian language, acknowledged sayings of Bacon, and adds to our stock of information :—

"Concerning *Hieroglyphics*, the word signifies, Sacred Scriptures, which were engraven on pillars, obelisks, pyramids, and other monuments, before the invention of letters. Thus the

\* *De Aug.* VI. i.



Egyptians were wont to express their minds by the pictures of such creatures as did in them some resemblance to the thing intended. By the shape of a Bee, they represented a King; intimating that he should be endowed with industry, honey, and a sting. By a serpent with his tail in his mouth, the year, which returns unto itself; and which was a *kind of*\* prophetic hieroglyphic . . . Many and great mysteries were this way delivered by the ancient priests, who did conceal all their learning under *such kind of* magical expressions . . . Like unto these hieroglyphics are the expressions by emblems; . . . of this nature are the stamps of many art medals, the impresses of arms, the frontispieces of books, etc." †

"An emblem," says "Francis Quarles" *To the Reader*, is but a silent parable . . . Before the knowledge of letters, ‡ God was known by Hieroglyphics. And indeed, what are the Heavens, the Earth, nay, every creature, but Hieroglyphics and Emblems of His Glory." Similar reference to the great Antiquity of Emblems, and their derivation from the Egyptians, is made in almost every Baconian work which approaches the subject from any side. Such frequent references point plainly to the studies which attracted Francis in boyhood, when, as we have seen, the young Red-cross Knight of fifteen or sixteen years old, was "travelling" through the learning of the Egyptian and Arabian philosophers, and endeavouring to satisfy himself, as to how much was good and true, how much corrupt, in their "Cabbala," or secret principles of philosophy and religion.

Perhaps it was then that his poetic spirit was stirred by the grandeur and beauty of much of the symbolism of "the Antique World," then, that he realised the practical use to which such Emblem pictures, and parabolic phraseology might be turned—"drawn into great variety by a witty talent or an inventive genius." He saw that the beautiful fables of the Ancients had been "miserably wrested and abused"—but adds:—"Though I have well weighed and considered all this, and thoroughly seen into the levity which the mind indulges for allegories and allusions, yet I cannot but retain a high value for the Ancient

\* Note the frequency of this expression with Bacon. It occurs three times in the short extract just quoted from *De Aug.* VI. i.

† Mercury, or the Secret and Swift Messenger, Chap. XII. 1st Edition, Anon. In later Editions the name of Bishop Wilkins was attached to this little book.

‡ Compare (*Ante*) Bacon, who says that Hieroglyphics were "older than the very elements of letters," and "*Mercury*," that they were "before the invention of letters."

Mythology. And, certainly, it were very injudicious to suffer the fondness and licentiousness of a few, to detract from the honour of Allegory and Parable in general. This would be rash, and almost profane; for since religion delights in such shadows and disguises, to abolish them were, in a manner, to prohibit all intercourse betwixt things divine and things human."

Elsewhere he pronounces the proper understanding and due use of them, to be amongst the "deficiencies" in learning which he was endeavouring to supply.

Although Bacon made free with the symbolic language of the ancients, there is no mysticism, in the sense of misty transcendentalism, in anything with which he had to do. His parables conceal, in order the better to teach; they are never puzzling, but elucidate and make clear, ideas which were dark, and clouded. His method is so simple; no far-fetched or exaggerated interpretations are needed to expound his parables, whether in words or pictures. It is, he says, illogical and irrational to wrest words from their true sense, in order to uphold some particular theory. It is the *bad thinking* which wrests the true speaking"\* and, to begin at the root of the matter, he must make men *think*.

Now to understand or still more to contrive or invent a metaphor, an emblem, or hieroglyphic picture, one must think; and when we find all the thinkers of one period thinking to the same effect, expressing their thoughts in similar language, and adorning their books with similar parable pictures, it cannot be illogical to argue that they all drew their ideas from a common source, all brought their pitchers to be filled at the same fountain.

So much space would not be devoted to the book plates, with which this volume is chiefly concerned, except for the conviction caused by these inquiries, that the "Emblem Writings," were emanations from Bacon's Secret Society, that from them we may learn the secret language of Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry, and that the symbols thus interpreted, still mark the books, the buildings—Yes, and even the productions of many minor arts and crafts, not in Europe alone, but in India, China, and other regions.

No wonder, we think, that in books on Masonry (the old books especially) much stress is laid upon the necessity for instruction in Hieroglyphics, and the accurate elucidation of Types, Allegorical Figures, Emblems, and Parables. Without such

\* *Much Ado*, III. iv. 33.



knowledge no Mason can rise in the scale ; for by these vehicles the higher traditions of the Society are conveyed.\*

Yet a few words, of a serious nature. Whilst seeking to interpret the emblematic pictures impressed upon the pages of our greatest literary age, we must remember that the ultimate object, the highest aspiration, the dream of those lofty minds who conceived them, was to mingle Heaven and Earth, to show how closely and inseparably things spiritual, and things material, the Esthetic and the Practical, Mind and Body, Shadow and Substance, are united.

"An Emblem is but a Silent Parable. Let not the tender eye check, to see the allusion to our blessed SAVIOUR figured in these types. In Holy Scripture, He is sometimes called a Sower ; sometimes a Fisher ; sometimes a Physician ; and why not presented so, as well to the Eye as to the Ear ? Before the knowledge of Letters, God was known by Hieroglyphics ; and indeed, what are the Heavens, the Earth, nay, every creature, but Hieroglyphics and Emblems of His Glory ?"†

"Symbolism," says another, "typical worship of the Supreme God, was a leading feature of religion in very early times, so instinctive a necessity of the oriental mind, that its birth was probably coeval with the most primitive systems of divine adoration . . . the theology of the East is incomprehensible without a knowledge of this symbolism . . . Religion would have little or no influence on the Hindu or the Persian, if she did not appeal to his imagination, as well as to his reason."‡

A highly glorious and imaginative view of God has therefore characterized the religion and philosophy of the East ; but as the multitude was not capable of ascending to the elevated conceptions of the teachers, the latter soon began to use emblems

\* It should, however, be said that poetical figures are capable, (as Bacon himself remarked) of being wrested to other than their true meanings. Recently we have had repeated occasion to be confirmed in the opinion expressed in the former part of this work, that a great change came o'er the spirit of the dream when the Freemasons, as now existing, parted from the high-minded Rosicrucians. This seems to have occurred in 1717. Since then very decidedly in Germany and France, and to a certain extent in England, *the ultimate aim of Freemasonry has been to abolish Christianity.* Many excellent and right-minded men are in the ranks ; they are totally unaware when they join that the objects of the community extend beyond those of a kind of Universal Benevolent Society, combined perhaps with a kind of trades-union with traditional secrets. So far good, but there is much more behind, as may be found by those who can get at the present history of Freemasonry in France and Germany.

† Introduction to *Quarles' Emblems.*

‡ Our Missionaries should take a hint from this.

by which they familiarised their followers with some of the great fundamental truths of all religious belief. Under the veil symbolism they concealed articles of doctrine, which they thought it unwise to expose to the gaze of the profane or ignorant. Thus in course of time, a typical language, as applied to creeds, became universal, but meanwhile the higher and grander ideas of the "All-Father," the Universal God—which belonged to the first imaginative view, faded away, and a lower, secondary form of fanciful types followed, producing such superstition, atheism, and general corruption, as we see, not only in heathen countries, but often, unhappily, even in the Christian countries of Europe and the West.

Schubert does not hesitate to assign the very highest origin to symbolic language. It is very striking, he says, that in all ages, all people have clothed the ideas of their dreams in the same imagery. It may therefore be asked whether the language which now occupies so low a place in the estimation of men, be not the actually waking language of the higher regions, while we, awake as we fancy ourselves, may not be sunk in a sleep of many thousand years, or at least in the echo of their dreams, and only intelligibly catch a few dim words of that language of God, as sleepers do scattered expressions from the loud conversation of those around them.\*

The Bible teaches throughout by symbols, types and parables, and most of the symbols are the same as those of Ancient India, Persia and Egypt. But these are not employed in the sacred volume, merely to fire and exalt the human imagination.

By Allegory and Parable, by visible types and similitudes in individuals, in historical events, and in the world of Nature, the "First book of God" not only reveals some dim idea of the Creator, His power, omniscience, universality, but it also clearly sets forth His will, and His commands, setting before the eyes of man the great pattern by which he must frame his life and conduct.

Of what practical use would it be to a man that he should be capable of forming a highly imaginative conception of the divine glory, if his religious life were to begin and end in this lofty dream? Would he become the more true, pure, generous, forgiving because he had learnt that all myths are "poetic-symbolic-metaphoric inspirations of a transcendent, material, power of nature, or the physical incarnation of an infinite spirit"?†

"Words, mere words, no matter from the heart."

\* Symbolism of Dreams. Introduction to Apocalypse. Book of God, p. 385.

† *The Poet as Seer*, Steinbeck.

Another German writer maintains that "all the writings of the early Indians are replete with expressions noble, clear, and severely grand; as deeply conceived, and reverentially expressed as in any human language in which men have spoken of their God . . . The mere conception of so grand an idea as the incarnation of a God, is an abiding proof of the profound reflective character of the Indian mind, and of the high degree of intelligence with which that people was endowed." \*

But here, again, we seem to see the religion of the Indian beginning and ending in a beautiful dream. What evidence is there that the poetical-religious philosophies of the East have produced any effects tending to the moral elevation of mankind? Here is some faith, but where are the works?† By such religion as this, men may be made calm, dreamy, fatalists, or, when roused to enthusiasm by priests or leaders—fierce or unreasoning fanatics, but the storm over, they settle down into the former deadly dullness and apathy, all goes on as before, no improvement, no progress. Immorality, ignorance, selfishness, go hand-in-hand, self-satisfied, where Faith rests only upon "poetic-symbolic-metaphoric inspirations."

It was otherwise when the veil of divine Mysticism was lifted, and Heaven and Earth, for the first time visibly mingled.

"The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His face, as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

The mystic rites and legends of India and Egypt, the mythologies and fables of Greece and Rome, ‡the types and ceremonials of the Hebrews, found their true solution and application in Christianity, and it may be said that, since the Advent of Christ, no new types have been offered, or have presented themselves. His Birth was the Birth of love as the Shepherds were taught by the Angels, singing:—

"Glory to God in the Highest, on Earth Peace, Goodwill to all men."

\*Schlegel's *Indian Philosophy*. Part I. pp. 61-65.

† The nearest approach to these are in the self-inflicted tortures, aceticism and resignation or fatalism of the Hermit Saints of India, and we cannot include these with works of elevating or edifying tendency.

‡ "The religion which attempts to be rid of the bodily side of things spiritual, sooner or later loses hold of all reality. Pure spiritualism, however noble the aspiration, however living the energy with which it starts, always has ended at last, and will always end in evanescence." Rev. J. R. Illingworth, in *Lux Mundi*, p. 272. The reason why the study of the ancient mythologies is so beset with difficulties, and the religions of which they are the expression, so wanting in the energy needful for advance, seems to be because such religions have no system, *no facts*, they consist in Names and Words, not Deeds or even aspirations.



With this joyous, simple message came the Living Type of all that is lovable and lovely—the Pattern of a practical human life of perfect unselfishness, in which Duty to God, and love to His Creatures are inseparably intermingled. Such studies as we hint at in these pages will, we trust, enable the reader to see how all great fundamental truths have been, from time immemorial, revealed or explained to mankind, by type, symbol, and parable, and that the symbols now in use, were known and understood thousands of years before the coming of the Saviour filled up the measure, perfecting the prophetic types, and revealing their true meaning.

This digression is prompted by remarks frequently made within our hearing, to the effect Symbols are things trivial, fit for children, unworthy of consideration in connection with matters of highest importance; inconceivably unworthy of the mighty mind of Bacon. A distinguished historian has actually endorsed such opinions. "*Man*," he says, "*has never, in the possession of an idea, amused himself by clothing it in symbols.*"\*

We trust that readers will detect this fallacy, and perceive in true symbolism an expression of thoughts too deep for words; an aid to simple minds not only during the world's pupilage, but even now, when the whole of our external worship is in a high degree symbolic—objects within our apprehension being brought to figure to us things beyond the reaches of our souls.

Bacon says that there are no true Metaphysics, for there is no break in the connection between God and Nature. To show Man, made in God's Image, inspired by God's Spirit; to remind us that by that Spirit we may do much, without it nothing, that a Soul, Reason, and Speech, distinguish Man from the brutes, that by the use of these great gifts of God, Man can and will raise himself, that love of Truth for Truth's sake will in the end secure the highest happiness; these, and such as these, are the matters which by signs and emblems are taught in the woodcuts, of which we have spoken. Who will say that either the subjects or their expression, are trivial or unprofitable?

\* Renan's *Life of Jesus*, p. 36.

## CORIOLANUS.

## I.

**DIRECTLY** we commence to study the play of *Coriolanus*, the first thing that strikes us, in the character of the hero of the play (from which it derives its name), is *his inordinate pride*. This key-note of the character of Caius Marcius is sounded at the opening of the play, where we are introduced to a company of mutinous Roman citizens discussing him :—

*Second Citizen.* Consider you what services he has done for his country ?

*First Citizen.* Very well ; and could be content to give him good report for it, *but that he pays himself with being proud*.

*Second Citizen.* Nay, but speak not maliciously.

*First Citizen.* I say unto you, what he hath done famously, he did it to that end : though soft-conscienced men can be content to say it was for his country, he did it to please his mother, *and to be partly proud ; which he is even to the altitude of his virtue*.

*Second Citizen.* What he cannot help in his nature, you account a vice in him. (Act I. i.)

This pride is very conspicuous in the speeches of Coriolanus, who, when he hears of the leader of the Volsces—Tullus Aufidius—exclaims :—

I sin in envying his nobility.

And were I anything but what I am,

I would wish me only he ! (Act I. i.)

This pride of Coriolanus excites the envy of Sicinius Velutus and Junius Brutus, tribunes of the people. Bacon writes :—“ Envy never makes holy-day—nothing but death reconciles envy to virtue. Envy doth put virtue to it, as *Juno did Hercules*. *Envy in a state is a wholesome ostracism*. (Envy. Antitheta Rerum, Liber VI., p. 308. *Advancement of Learning*, 1640.)

Now we are going to find all, and each of these texts, exactly applied and paralleled in this play of *Coriolanus*. But first as to the envy.

*Sicinius.* Was ever man so proud as is this Martius ?

*Brutus.* He has no equal.

*Sicinius.* When we were chosen tribunes for the people——

*Brutus.* Mark'd you his lip and eyes ?

*Sicinius.* Nay but his taunts.

*Brutus.* Being moved, he will not spare to gird the Gods.

*Sicinius.* Bemock the modest moon.

*Brutus.* The present wars devour him ; *he is grown too proud*  
to be so valiant. (Act I. i.)

---

This pride of Coriolanus is the sole topic of the envious diatribes of these two tribunes. In the second act, we find once more this:—

*Brutus.* He's poor in no one fault, but stored with all.

*Sicinius.* *Especially in pride.* (Act II. i.)

To this, Menenius Agrippa, a friend to Coriolanus, replies:—

*Men.* You blame Martius for *being proud* ?

*Brutus.* We do it not alone, sir. (*Ib.* II. i. 36.)

---

Coriolanus is again described:—

That's a brave fellow, but he's vengeance *proud*, and  
loves not the common people. (Act II. ii.)

It is not so much the pride of Coriolanus, as his impotence to conceal it, that brings about his overthrow—his ostracism and his death! When his mother asks him to dissimulate and flatter the people, in order to beg the consulship at their hands, he promises obedience, but a word upsets him, and he undoes everything by his ungovernable anger and contempt of the common people. Bacon writes:—"Pride wants the best condition of vice, *that is concealment.*"

(Antitheta Rerum. Pride XIV.)

Bacon writes of *Envy*:—"Above all, those are most subject to *Envy*, which carry the greatness of their fortunes in an insolent and *proud manner*; being never well, but while they are showing how great they are, either by outward pomp, or by triumphing over all opposition, or competition; whereas wise men will rather do sacrifice to *envy*."

"Now to speak of *public envy*. There is yet some good in *public envy*; whereas in private there is none. For *public envy* is as an ostracism, that eclipseth men, when they grow too great. This envy, being in the Latin word *Invidia*, goeth in the modern language, by the name of discontentment. Of which we shall speak in handling sedition. It is a disease in a state, like to infection. For as infection spreadeth upon that



which is sound and tainteth it ; so when *envy* is gotten once into a state, it traduceth even the best actions thereof, and turneth them into an ill odour.” (Essays, Envy, 1625.)

Now this passage, upon *public envy*, finds a miraculous echo in the play we are discussing. Indeed, Coriolanus is banished from Rome, or *ostracised*, on account of the *public envy*, of his virtues and pride, which the tribunes Brutus and Sicinius stir up and nourish in the Roman populace. In Brutus and Sicinius, we have the most remarkable instances of particular or private envy—the play being almost entirely surrendered to the growth and action of this private envy :—

*Brutus.* In this point charge him home, that he affects  
Tyrannical power : if he evade us there,  
Enforce him with his *envy* to the people.  
(Act III. iii.)

For that he has  
As much as in him lies, from time to time  
*Envied* against the people, seeking means  
To pluck away their power. (Act. III. iii.)

The result of this speech is that Coriolanus is *ostracised*,\* falling a victim to the private and public envy of the Tribunes and the Roman people at the same time.

*Sicinius.* In the name of the people  
And in the power of us the tribunes, we,  
Even from this instant, *banish him our city*,

\* We have found Bacon writing that, “*Envy in a state is a wholesome ostracism.*” (Essays, Envy, also Antitheta Rerum XVI.)

Not only is this illustrated by the case of Coriolanus, but also in the play of *Richard the Second*. The play opens with the quarrels of Bolingbroke (afterwards King Henry the Fourth), and Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk. King Richard *banishes* them with these words :—

And for we think the eagle-winged pride  
Of sky aspiring and ambitious thoughts,  
*With rival-hating envy*, set on you  
To wake our peace—

\* \* \* \*

Therefore we *banish* you our territories.

(*King Richard II.*, I. iii.)

Bacon writes :—“The causes and motive of seditions are ; —  
*advancement of unworthy persons.* It is certain, so many *overthrown estates, so many votes for troubles.*” (Essays, Seditions and Troubles, 1625). Both these points are illustrated in the play of *King Richard the Second*. One of the chief causes of the overthrow of the King was his advancement of the unworthy persons—Bushy, Green, and Bagot. Another of these causes was his overthrow of the estate of Bolingbroke, which the king confiscated after his banishment.

In peril of precipitation  
 From off the rock Tarpeian never more  
 To enter our Roman gates : i' the people's name,  
 I say it shall be so.

*Citizens.* It shall be so, it shall be so ; let him away ;  
*He's banished, and it shall be so.*

(Act III. iii.)

We have found Bacon calling envy, " a *disease* in a state like to *infection*. For as *infection spreadeth* upon that which is sound, and tainteth it ; so when *envy* is gotten once into a state, it traduceth even the best actions thereof, and turneth them into an ill odour " (Envy).

Now mark this parallel—

*Sicinius.* He's a *disease* that must be cut away.

*Menenius.* O, he's a limb that has but a *disease*,  
 Mortal, to cut it off, to cure it, easy.

(Act III. i.)

\* \* \* \*

*Brutus.* We'll hear no more.

Pursue him to his house, and pluck him thence  
*Lest his infection, being of catching nature,*  
*Spread further.*

(Act III. i.)

Coriolanus is a perfect example of a character, who carries his greatness, " in an insolent and proud manner," as Bacon puts it. His contempt of the people knows no bounds, and his pride is just that sort of pride, which Bacon describes, *as wanting in concealment*.

When Bacon writes upon Envy—" Envy doth put virtue to it as *Juno did Hercules*," there is very little doubt he is writing and pointing at the play we are discussing. For example, Volumnia it is who puts Coriolanus to it—and it is Volumnia who is compared to Juno in the play. Volumnia exclaims :—

*Vol.* Leave this faint puling and lament as I do,  
*In anger Juno-like.*

(*Cor.*, IV., ii., 53.)

\* \* \* \*

*Vol.* Honourable Menenius, my boy Marcius  
 Approaches ; *for the love of Juno lets go !*

(*Cor.*, Act II., i.)

Coriolanus compares his mother to the wife of Hercules :—

*Cor.* Nay, mother,

Resume that spirit, when you were wont to say,

If you had been the wife of *Hercules*,  
 Six of his labours you'd have done, and saved  
 Your husband so much sweat. (Cor., IV. i. 17.)

\* \* \* \* \*

Indeed, Coriolanus is described as a sort of *Hercules* :—

*Cominius*. He will shake  
 Your Rome about your ears

*Menenius*. As *Hercules*  
 Did shake down mellow fruit.  
 (Cor., IV. vi. 99.)

It will be remembered that Juno was jealous of Alcmena, the mother of Hercules, and on this account, put the hero to all sorts of endless and impossible tasks of heroism. It is to just such tasks that Volumnia puts Coriolanus; and finally, when she persuades her son to spare Rome, it culminates in leading to his sacrifice and death at the hands of the Volscians. Bacon writes: "Nothing but death doth reconcile envy to virtue," (*Antitheta Rerum*, Envy xvi.). This is completely realised in the case of Coriolanus, who arouses the jealousy and envy of Aufidius, which leads to the final end of the hero.

Bacon says of Envy :—"Lastly, to conclude this part ; as we said in the beginning, that the act of envy had somewhat in it of witchcraft ; for there is no other cure of envy but the cure of witchcraft. And that is, to remove the *lot* (as they call it), and to lay it upon another. For which purpose, the wiser sort of great persons, bring in ever upon the stage somebody upon whom to derive the envy that would come upon themselves." (*Envy*, 1625.)

We may justly ask ourselves, whether Bacon is not giving us in this passage a profound hint for his own case, as one of the wiser sort of great persons, who perceived, that it would be well to bring in upon the stage somebody (Shakespeare?), in order to derive the envy, that would certainly come upon one, who was not only a Lord Chancellor, but a writer of prose works (which attained a European reputation during his life), and an acknowledged great philosopher? We perceive throughout the plays the most side-piercing apprehension of the dangers produced by too much greatness—resulting in envy. It is painted large in the conspiracy of Cassius and Casca against Cæsar, in the play of that name. We perceive it at work throughout the play of *Coriolanus*. Bacon writes : "They that desire to excell in too many matters, out of levity and vain glory, are ever envious, for they cannot want work, it being



impossible ; but many, in some one of those things, should surpass them. Which was the character of Adrian the Emperor, that mortally *envied Poets*, and *painters*, and *artificers*, in works, wherein he had a vein to excell." (Envy Essays, 1625.)

Let the hint be noted Bacon gives us in the words relating to the stage—"bring in ever upon the stage"—for Shakespeare was an actor, as well as a stage manager. We may ask ourselves, also, whether Bacon did not recognize fully for himself, the dangers he points out, arising from those who "*envied poets*," seeing Bacon excelled in such matters himself.

Aufidius sums up the character of Coriolanus with these words :—

First he was  
A noble servant to them ; but he could not  
Carry his honours even : whether t'was *pride*,  
Which out of daily fortune ever taints  
The happy man ——

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*

But he has a merit  
To choke it in the utterance. So our virtues  
Lie in the interpretation of the time.  
And power, unto itself most commendable,  
Hath not a tomb so evident as a chair  
To extol what it hath done.  
One fire drives out one fire, one nail one nail,  
Rights by rights falter, strengths by strengths do fail.

(Act IV. vii.)

This play is a sermon upon Bacon's text : "*Pride is the insinuating ivy to virtues and all good qualities.*" (*Pride, Antitheta Rerum XIV.*) Then, on the other side, Bacon says of *Pride* : "*Pride is even with vices incompatible. And as poison is expelled by poison*, so many vices are by pride." (*Id. Pro.*) The student will, of course, recognize in a moment the two last lines of the quotation just made. As evil often expels evil, so too much good may cancel good. For example, war is an evil, but a righteous or just war may be the means of ending an unrighteous or unjust war. A little poison taken as medicine may and does do us good often, and may serve as an antidote to another poison. So with Coriolanus, his excellencies were of such a nature that, unable to dissimulate, and always speaking his mind, he choked his virtues in their utterance. Bacon is here enunciating, in the character of Coriolanus, the theory that too great virtues of the heroic kind are full of danger to their possessor, unless tempered by some vice, such

as concealment, on account of the private and public envy they excite. The passage is so curious that it is almost impossible not to apply it to Bacon himself, and, indeed, I cannot help thinking Bacon was thinking of himself when he penned the seven last lines upon virtues ! When we think of Lord Bacon, we see him as he is sculptured, *seated in a chair at his tomb in Saint Michael's Church, St. Albans*, with the words *Sic Sedebat*—"thus he was wont to be seated." Indeed, it is always being recognized that men's "virtues lie in the interpretation of the time," but never more than in the case of Francis Bacon, when just three hundred years after his life, we are beginning to discover a little of his virtues ! I think myself, Bacon intended to paint in the character of Coriolanus, a man of Herculean or heroic virtue, *in contest with envy* ; and to show us that unless we can in some measure dissimulate, or flatter, our very virtues may become our undoing ! Let us remember that Francis Bacon was successful not only in his law career, and attained to its highest dignity, the Lord Chancellorship, but was also a philosophical and prose writer, who acquired a European reputation during his own lifetime. If we in these liberal days feel, perhaps, the incongruity of a Lord Keeper, or a Lord Chancellor uniting in one person the majesty of the law, and the laurels of poet laureate, and successful playwright—then it was ten times more incongruous during Queen Elizabeth's reign, when neither poet or dramatist enjoyed any social privileges, and were often not respectable !

Bacon seems to have perfectly realized in full the dangers and evil powers of envy. Doubtless he experienced sufficient of it at the hands of his cousin Cecil, or from his old enemy, Coke, for he has embodied his reflections thereon, in an essay dedicated to it. How we find these studies reflected in the plays may be seen in the envy of Casca and Cassius for Julius Cæsar ; in the envy of Brutus and Sicinius for Coriolanus ; in the envy of the bastard for his brother, in *King John* ; in the envy of Bolingbroke and the Duke of Norfolk, in *King Richard the Second* ; or of the nobles for Wolsey, in *King Henry the Eighth* !

Upon page 108 (Liber II.) of the Advancement of Learning we find Bacon writing upon *Poesy Allusive or Parabolical* : "Hence the symbols of Pythagoras ; the Ænigmas of Sphinx ; and the fables of Æsop ; and the like. So the Apophthegms of the ancient sages were likewise expressed by similitudes. So *Menenius Agrippa*, amongst the Romans, a nation in that age not learned, repressed a sedition by a fable." (Advancement of Learning, 1640.) This fable is the fable of the *Belly and the Members*, with which we find the same Menenius Agrippa repressing a

sedition of the Roman people, in the first scene of the first act of the play of *Coriolanus*. This is no new discovery, but cannot be omitted in the marshalling of our evidence as to the authorship of this play.

In Bacon's essay upon "*Seditions and Troubles*," we find him writing: "Concerning the materials of sedition. It is a thing well to be considered. The matter of sedition is of two kinds; *much poverty and much discontentment*." (Essay, 1625.)

It is just this poverty with which the play of *Coriolanus* opens, producing discontentment. Bacon continues, "And if this poverty and broken estate, in the better sort, be joined with a want and necessity in the mean people, the danger is imminent and great. For the rebellions of the belly (*Quæ a Ventre ortum habent*) are the worst."

In his essay upon *Envy*, Bacon writes:—"There shall be none of the affections, which have been noted to *fascinate or bewitch, but love and envy*." In describing the popularity of Coriolanus with the soldiers he commands, a lieutenant of the Volscian army is made to say:—

I do not know what *witchcraft's* in him, but  
Your soldiers use him as the grace 'fore meat,  
Their talk at table, and their thanks at end.

(*Cor.*, IV. vii. 2.)

And we find Coriolanus himself describing just this sort of popular love (in Bacon's words) as *bewitching, or bewitchment*:—

I will, sir, flatter my sworn brother, the people, to earn a dearer estimation of them; 'tis a condition they account gentle; and since the wisdom of their choice is rather to have my hat than my heart, I will practice the insinuating nod and be off to them most counterfeitedly; that is, sir, I will counterfeit the *bewitchment of some popular man*.—(*Cor.*, II. iii. 102.)

In just this sense, as the power of *charming*, we find Cleopatra's fascination described:—

O this false soul of Egypt, this grave charm.  
Antony exclaims—

For when I am revenged upon my charm,  
I have done all.

(*Ant.*, IV. 12, 16.)

It is to be observed that Bacon uses the word *envy* to signify jealousy and hatred, according to the classic sense of the word *invidia*, as spite, ill-will, malice.



The play of *Coriolanus* should be studied in relationship to the character of Julius Cæsar, as depicted in the play of that name. In both plays we are presented with two noble Romans, who are successful soldiers, and attain to the highest martial honours. But whilst Julius Cæsar is represented as a brave man, he is also presented as a profound *dissembler*—in short, a master of those arts, which seek and attain popularity, by means of concealing the inner man. Cæsar is painted, as feeling just the same sort of contempt for the Roman common people as Coriolanus feels, but with the great difference, that while the former conceals his contempt, the latter reveals it, and revels in unbosoming himself of his scorn. Both these characters are victims of envy, both meet with a violent and tragic end, on account of the envy—but brought about differently. Bacon writes :—" Concerning that all are more or less subject to envy. First, persons of eminent virtues—envy is ever enjoined, with the comparing of a man's self, and where there is no comparison, no envy."

(*Envy*, *Essays*, 1625).

This comparison is most marked in both plays. Particularly is it conspicuous in the envy of Aufidius for Coriolanus. He exclaims to the latter :—

We hate alike,  
Not Afric owns a serpent I abhor  
More than thy fame and *envy*.

(*Cor.*, I. viii.)

The comparison between the two generals is made by the servants (in Act IV. v.) of Aufidius, and finally his lieutenant remarks to him :—

And you are darken'd in this action, sir,  
Even by your own.—(Act IV. vii.)

The envy of Brutus and Sicinius Velutus should be paralleled with the envy of Casca and Cassius for Julius Cæsar. The envy of the two former is painted with very great skill in the first scene of Act II. of *Coriolanus*. Bacon writes :—" Nay, some have been so curious, as to note that the times when the stroke, or percussion of an envious eye doth most hurt, are, *when the party envied is beheld in glory or triumph, for that sets an edge upon envy.*"—(*Envy*, *Essays*, 1625.)

Let the reader open the play at the point where, with cornets and in state, Coriolanus is pictured, as led *crowned in triumph to the Capitol, to be made consul*. It will be seen that the envy of the two tribunes of the people, Brutus and Sicinius, is set on edge, just at this juncture of triumph !

*Brutus.* All tongues speak of him, and the bleared sights  
 Are spectacled to see him : your prattling nurse  
 Into a rapture lets her baby cry,  
 While she chats him : the kitchen malkin pins  
 Her richest 'lockram 'bout her reechy neck,  
 Clambering the walls to eye him. Stalls, bulks, windows,  
 Are smother'd up, leads fill'd, and ridges horsed  
 With variable complexions, all agreeing  
 In earnestness to see him ; seld-shown flamens  
 Do press among the popular throngs, and puff  
 To win a vulgar station. Our veil'd dames  
 Commit the war of white and damask in  
 Their nicely gawded cheeks to the wanton spoil  
 Of Phebus 'burning kisses. Such a pother,  
 As if that whatsoever God that leads him  
 Where sily crept into his human powers  
 And gave him graceful posture.

*Sic.* On the sudden I warrant him consul.

*Brutus.* Then our office may,  
 During his power go sleep.

*Sic.* He cannot temperately transport his honours  
 From where he should begin and end, but will  
 Lose those that he hath won.

*Brutus.* In that there's comfort.

(Act II. i. 221.)

Bacon writes of *Praise and Reputation* :—" The lowest virtues draw praises from the common people ; the middle virtues work in them astonishment or admiration ; but of the highest virtues they have no sense or piercing at all."

(*Antitheta Rerum IX. Contra.*)

Volumnia, the mother of Coriolanus, after his banishment, exclaims to Brutus, one of the tribunes of the people :—

'Twas you incensed the rabble :  
 Cats that can judge as fitly of his worth  
 As I can of those mysteries which heaven  
 Will not have earth to know.—(*Cor. IV. ii. 34.*)

Bacon writes of *Popularity* :—" No terms of moderation takes place with the vulgar." (*Antitheta Rerum, Popularity Contra XXX.*) This is powerfully reflected in the following speech, concerning the common, or vulgar people, delivered by Coriolanus :—

What would you have, you curs,  
 That like not peace nor war ? The one affrights you,

The other makes you proud. He that trusts to you,  
 Where he should find you lions, finds you hares ;  
 Where foxes, geese : you are no surer, no,  
 Than is the coal of fire upon the ice,  
 Or hailstone in the sun. Your virtue is  
 To make him worthy whose offence subdues him  
 And curse that justice did it. Who deserves greatness  
 Deserves your hate ; and your affections are  
 A sick man's appetite, who desires most that  
 Which would increase his evil. He that depends  
 Upon your favours swims with fins of lead,  
 And hews down oaks with rushes. Hang ye ! Trust ye ?  
*With every minute you do change a mind,  
 And call him noble that was now your hate,  
 Him vile that was now your garland.* (Act I. i. 172.)

Coriolanus exclaims in another passage :—

For the mutable, rank-scented many, let them  
 Regard me as I do not *flatter*, and  
 Therein behold themselves.—*Cor.* III. i. 68.)

Indeed, the character of Coriolanus is incapable of either flattery, or dissimulation, of any sort. Whatever he thinks, he must utter, at no matter what cost. Menenius describes him :—

His nature is too noble for the world :  
 He would not *flatter* Neptune for his trident,  
 Or Jove for powers to thunder. His heart's his mouth :  
 What his breast forges, that his tongue must vent ;  
 And, being angry, does forget that ever  
 He heard the name of death. (*Cor.* III., i. 256.)

Bacon says : “ To honour the people is to be honoured.” (*Popularity*), but Coriolanus cannot honour the people. So well does Volumnia, his mother, know his character, that she exclaims :—

Go and be ruled : although I know thou had'st rather  
 Follow thine enemy in a fiery gulf  
 Than *flatter* him in a bower. (*Cor.* III., ii. 89.)

It is just in this point of his mother's advice to him, to *dissemble* his feelings before the populace, when begging for the consulship, that we understand the application of Bacon's *Dissimulation* (with its *pro.* and *contra.*) in his *Antitheta Rerum*. Volumnia says :—

I would *dissemble* with my nature where  
 My fortunes and my friends at stake required.  
 (*Cor.* III., ii. 62.)



Bacon writes, "*Dissimulation is a compendious wisdom*" (Pro.): Again (under the same head, for or in favour) of dissimulation: "*Dissimulation is both a grace and a guard.*"

(*Antitheta Rerum XXXII.*)

On the other side Bacon writes: "*What hath a good man to do with the dull approbation of the vulgar?*" (Praise or Reputation.)

Under the heading of *Popularity*, Bacon writes: — "*To fawn on the people, is the lowest degree of flattery.*"

(*Pop. Contra. XXX., Ant. Rerum*, p. 315 *Adv. of L.* 1640.)

And again under *Flattery*, Bacon writes: — "*Flattery is the style of servants.*" ("Flattery," *Contra. [Ib. p. 319].*)

It is just this flattery of the populace that the pride of the patrician Coriolanus abhors. Nevertheless, at his mother's earnest entreaty, in order to beg the consulship of Rome at the hands of the people, he promises to use flattery:—

*Cor.* Pray be content :

Mother, I am going to the market place ;

Chide me no more. I'll mountebank their loves,

Coy their hearts from them, and come home beloved

Of all the trades in Rome. I'll return consul

Or never trust to what my tongue can do

*I' the way of flattery further.*

(*Cor.*, III. ii. 130.)

But all the same Coriolanus cannot keep his word, for his violent temper and proud spirit prove too strong for his promises. When his friend Menenius Agrippa counsels calmness, Coriolanus replies :—

Ay, as an ostler, that for the poorest piece

Will bear the knave by the volume.

(*Cor.*, III. iii. 32.)

It will be observed that Coriolanus is repeating here Bacon's text upon flattery (from the *Contra*, or opposed point of view), *i.e.* "*That flattery is the style of servants,*" the style of an ostler who for the poorest piece of money, will bear from a knave a volume of abuse, or suffer anything. Whether the word "*bear*" means here sufferance, or calmness, it is plain the context implies servility, or flattery (active or passive) *for the sake of gain.*

Coriolanus, however, despises the populace so profoundly that when it comes to the point he loses control of his temper, and falls a prey to the machinations of the two tribunes of the people, Brutus and Sicinius, who stir up the popular envy. Bacon

writes:—"A proud man, while he despiseth others, prejudiceth himself."

("Pride," *Antitheta Rerum*\* XIV., *Contra*.)

(*Liber VI.*, p. 307. *Adv. of L.*.)

This text is completely realised in this play, for Coriolanus prejudices his own fortune from his inability to honour the people.

Another of Bacon's texts realised in this play is:—"He that hath wife and children, hath given hostages to fortune."

("Wife and Children," *Antitheta Rerum*\* *Contra*. V. p. 302 *Ib.*)

It is on account of his wife and child (and mother) that Caius Marcius Coriolanus spares Rome, with the result that it leads to his death. Another very interesting portion of Bacon's texts, or promptuary cues (or skeins to be unravelled) applicable to this play is the following:—"He that carries all things with an open frankness deceives, as he that somewhat dissembles. For many either do not comprehend him, or do not believe him."

("Dissimulation," *Antitheta Rerum* XXXII. *Pro.* p. 315.)

(*Adv. of L.* 1640.)

This text is profoundly reflected in the open character of Coriolanus, who becomes the victim of what a Senator of the Volscians calls "a violent popular ignorance." This play is really an exquisite sermon upon the passions of pride, anger, envy (private and popular) portrayed in a man of patrician birth, and heroic virtue, who cannot dissemble his contempt for the people. Bacon writes, "To contain anger from mischief, though it take hold of a man, there be two things whereof you must have special caution. The one of extreme bitterness of words, especially if they be aculeate and proper, for *communia maledicta* are nothing so much." ("Anger," *Essays* 1625.) This may be applied to the speeches of Coriolanus, which are full of bitterness of words, if not *communia maledicta*, or revilings, aimed at the Roman common people.

\*It is to be noted that Bacon is strictly impartial in the form under which he has presented us these *Antitheta Rerum*. We must not identify either the *pro* or the *contra* with Bacon himself, but merely view these as texts for characters, situations, actions, in the plays open to discussion and unwinding. It will be asked, Why has Bacon thought fit to cast up these *Antitheta* in a double or opposed shape of for and against? One answer is evident. Everything has a double or twofold aspect, according as we view actions, with regard to their present or future aspects, their material or spiritual conditions, their expediency, or their want of expediency, for nothing stands single and alone. And this is particularly Bacon's philosophy, who remarks, "For who knows not that the doctrines of contraries are the same, though they be opposite in use." (*Book VI.*, p. 209, *Adv. of L.*, 1640.)

With regard to my statement that Julius Cæsar was a *dissembler*, here is Bacon's judgment upon him, which, it will be seen, agrees completely with the character Casca attributes to Cæsar, in the second Scene, Act I. of *Julius Cæsar*. Bacon writes :—

“ And in all other things he passed, not for a crafty, deceitful person ; but for an open-hearted and plain-dealing man. And whereas he was indeed an *Arch-Politician*, that could counterfeit and dissemble, sufficiently well ; and was wholly compounded of frauds and deceits ; so that there was nothing sincere in him, but all artificial ; yet he covered and disguised himself so, that no such vices appeared to the eyes of the world ; but he was generally reputed to proceed plainly and uprightly with all men.” (“ A Civil Character of Julius Cæsar,” page 282, *Resuscitatio* 1661.)

With regard to my last article (on Bacon's “ Colours of Good and Evil ”) I would point out, that the *History of Britain* Bacon proposed should be written by “ so many good painters for hand and colours,” was really fulfilled in the series of the *Chronicle plays* !

Bacon writes of *Poetry*, *History*, and *Painting* thus :—“ Poesy, in that sense, we have expounded it, is likewise of individuals, fancied to the similitude of those things, which in true history are recorded. Poesy composeth, and introduceth at pleasure, even as *Painting* doth.”

(Chap. I., Liber II., p. 77., *Advancement of Learning*, 1640.)

W. F. C. WIGSTON.





## "SHAKESPEARE'S HISTORY OF ELIZABETH."

## PART II.

No. 20.—DATE 1586-7: MARY, ARRAIGNED AND CONDEMNED.  
Act IV., Scene 1.

Beginning and ending the same.

THE event towards which, Elizabeth and her ministers had for years been pressing forward, had at length arrived, they had hunted the unfortunate Queen of Scots into their toils, whose end was predetermined.

*Hub.*—Heat me these irons hot ; and look thou stand,  
Within the arras : when I strike my foot  
Upon the bosom of the ground, rush forth,  
And bind the boy, which you shall find with me,  
Fast to the chair : be heedful : hence, and watch.

February 1, 1586-7.—Walsingham, by Elizabeth's commands, wrote to Sir Amyas Paulet expressing surprise that he, Sir A. P., had not in all that time (without other provocation) found some way of shortening the life of the Scottish Queen, complaining that the burden should be cast upon the Queen (Elizabeth) of shedding blood."

Sir A. P., in his reply, bitterly regrets that he had lived to see the unhappy day in which he was required by direction of his most gracious sovereign to do an act which God and the law forbiddeth.

*First Attend.*—I hope your warrant will bear out the deed.  
[bear the responsibility.]

Elizabeth, on being informed of his reply (fell into terms of offence), complained of the *daintiness* and perjury of him and others, who contrary to the oath of association, did throw the burden upon herself, blaming the *niceness* of those precise fellows, who in words would do great things for her surety, but in deed performed nothing.

*Hub.*—Uncleanly scruples ! fear not you : look to't.

October 12th, 1586.—The Commissioners opened their court, but Mary refused to acknowledge their authority, whereupon they delivered to her Elizabeth's letter, which, in brief and imperious terms, required, charged, and commanded her (Mary) to make answer, as if she (Elizabeth) were herself present.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Elizabeth*, 1586-7.

*Hub.*—Young lad, come forth ; I have to say with you.

October 14th, 1586.—At the early hour of nine in the morning, Mary entered the hall, passing through a double file of halberdiers who formed a lane from her chamber door, conducted by her physician Bourgoigne, and Sir Andrew Melville. The chair provided for her studiously indicated her inferiority.

*Hub.*—Good morrow little prince.

Mary paused in indignant surprise, and proudly observed, I am a Queen by birth, and have been the consort of a King of France. My place should be there, glancing at the vacant seat beneath the canopy. Having thus asserted her claims to the honours of regality, and marked the breach of etiquette of which her foes had been guilty, the transient flash of anger subsided.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1586-7.

*Arth.*—As little prince (having so great a title to be more prince) as may be.—You are sad.

On the morrow Mary again appeared before the Commissioners whose hostility she had fully proved, by the manner in which Burleigh and the Lord Chancellor endeavoured to brow-beat her, in her defenceless position. In the course of her defence, she said, my innocence is well known to God, my crimes consist of my birth.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1586.

*Arth.*—Is it my fault that I was Geoffrey's son ?

\* \* \* \*

The iron of itself, though heat red-hot,  
Approaching near these eyes, would drink my tears,  
And quench this fiery indignation,  
Even in the matter of mine innocence.

December 18, 1586.—Mary wrote her last letter to Elizabeth.

The effect produced by this touching, but dignified appeal to the conscience of Elizabeth, is rather hinted at than described by the pitiless satrap Leicester, in one of his letters to Walsingham. There is a letter from the Scottish Queen, writes he, "that hath wrought tears, but I trust, shall do no further herein ; albeit the delay is too dangerous."

Miss Strickland, *Life of Elizabeth*, 1586.

*Hub.*—[*Aside.*] If I talk to him, with this innocent prate  
He will awake my mercy, which lies dead :  
Therefore I will be sudden and despatch.

November 22, 1586.—The next move was to announce to Mary the sentence, and to see whether a confession of its justice could

be drawn from her; for this purpose Lord Buckhurst and Mr. Beale were sent down to Fotheringay. They were to take advantage of her terror and distress of mind to draw from her this important admission, but in this the messengers signally failed. Mary heard the sentence with an air of composure, protested against its injustice, but declared that death would be welcome to her as an escape from her weary captivity.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1586.

*Hub.*—[*Aside.*] His words do take possession of my bosom,—  
Read here, young Arthur. [Showing a paper.]

[*Aside.*] How now, foolish rheum!  
Turning dispiteous torture out of door!  
I must be brief, lest resolution drop  
Out at my eyes in tender womanish tears,—  
Can you not read it? is it not fair writ?

*Arth.*—Too fairly, Hubert, for so foul effect;

From all that we have gathered in our investigations, there was no one but the Earl of Mar, with whom Mary was associated, that the following speech of Arthur's would so accurately portray, and the circumstance relates to the negotiations for her transfer to the Scottish Lords, 1572.

Hostages were, in fact, to be given that Mary should be brought to trial and executed within four hours after her consignment by the English authorities to the rebel Lords within her own realm. "Mar" faltered and required time for consideration; he had been Mary's guardian and tutor from the time she was brought for refuge to the Priory of Inchmahone, and had never been separated from her till her marriage with the Dauphin; he had seen her grow up from infancy to early womanhood, in endearing domestication with himself. Dearly had she loved him, gratefully had she repaid his attentions, fatally had she trusted him, perhaps of all the traitors who betrayed their orphan Queen for English gold—calumniated and plotted against her life—"Mar" is the most inexcusable.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1572.

*Arth.*—Have you the heart? When your head did but ache,  
I knit my handkerchief about your brows  
(The best I had, a princess wrought it me),  
And I did never ask it you again;  
And with my hand at midnight held your head;  
And like the watchful minutes to the hour,  
Still and anon cheer'd up the heavy time.  
Saying "What lack you?" and, "Where lies your  
grief?"



Or "What good love may I perform for you?"  
 Many a poor man's son would have lain still,  
 And ne'er have spoke a loving word to you,  
 But you at your sick service had a prince  
 Nay, you may think my love was crafty love,  
 And call it cunning:—do, an if you will;  
 If Heaven be pleas'd that you must use me ill,  
 Why, then you must.—Will you put out mine eyes?  
 These eyes that never did, nor never shall  
 So much as frown on you?

Mary summoned to execution.

Thomas Andrews, who finding the ante-chamber door barred and locked, smote loudly against it with his wand to warn her that the hour was come.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1587.

*Hub.*—[Stamps.] Come forth.

Her own servants, overpowered with grief and horror, followed her weeping and lamenting, but when they reached the outer door of the gallery, they were rudely stopped, and a passionate scene ensued; all refused to be separated from their royal mistress and tried to force their way after her, but were thrust back with threats and uncivil language. [*Ibid.*]

*Arth.*—Alas! what need you be so boisterous rough?

Bourgoigne appealed to the Earls but could not prevail. Mary herself addressed them, and after making certain requests, she said, I conjure you that these poor afflicted servants of mine may be present with me at my death, that their eyes may behold how patiently their queen and mistress will endure it. [*Ibid.*]

*Arth.*—I will not stir, nor wince, nor speak a word,  
 Nor look upon the *iron* angrily:

The Earl of Kent with unprecedented brutality refused her request, her tears burst forth, and with indignant emotion, she said, I am cousin of your Queen, descended from the blood royal of Henry 7th, a married Queen of France, and the anointed Queen of Scotland. The Earls and her keepers at last gave way, and admitted some of her servants, and afterwards Sir Andrew Melville, with whom she spoke earnestly, one of the commissioners, doubtless the pitiless Earl of Kent, here interrupted by reminding her that time was wearing apace. Farewell, said she, good Melville. Farewell. [*Ibid.*]

*Hub.*—Go stand within; let me alone with him.

*First Attend.*—I am best pleas'd to be from such a deed.

The Author of the play, having brought the history of the sad ending of Mary's career to within the last few steps, ingeniously draws a veil, by interposing lines of great beauty and significance, and finishes up this scene of surpassing interest by a short review (as we venture to think) of the line of conduct pursued by Sir Ralph Sadler, who, on Mary arriving a fugitive into England, advocated her being put to death. He was one of the Commissioners at York, and afterwards her keeper, but standing as he now was, on the threshold of eternity, he beheld things in a light more worthy of a Christian; finally he learned to speak of her with respect and tenderness, and as far as he dared, insinuated the propriety of her being treated with kindness and good faith by his sovereign.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1585.

*Hub.*—Well, see to live; I will not touch thine eyes  
For all the treasure that thine uncle owes;  
Yet I am sworn, and I did purpose boy,  
With this *same very iron* to burn them out.

No. 21.—DATE 1559: THE ACT OF RECOGNITION AND MARY  
STUART'S RELEASE PETITIONED FOR.

Act IV., Scene 2.

Beginning: *K. John.*—Here once again we sit, once again  
crown'd.

Ending: *K. John.*—Let it be so; I do commit his youth  
To your direction.

Elizabeth's first care was to procure an act for the recognition and declaring of her own title, from her parliament which was unanimously passed, and without any allusion to her mother's marriage, or to the stigma that had previously been put on her own birth.—Miss Strickland's *Life of Elizabeth*, 1559.

*Pemb.*—This "once again" but that your highness pleas'd,  
Was once superfluous: you were crown'd before.

\* \* \* \*

*Sal.*—Therefore, to be possess'd with double pomp,  
To guard a title that was rich before,  
To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,

\* \* \* \*

To smooth the ice, or add another hue  
Under the rainbow, . . . .  
Is wasteful and ridiculous excess.

\* \* \* \*

And, like a shifted wind unto a sail,  
 It makes the course of thoughts to fetch about  
 Startles and frights consideration ;  
 Makes sound opinion sick and truth suspected,  
 For putting on so new a fashion'd robe.

But a nobler spirit, says Miss Strickland, would it have been to have used the influence for the vindication of her mother's honour, by causing the statutes which defamed her, to be swept away from the records. The want of moral courage on the part of Elizabeth in leaving this duty unperformed was injurious to her royal dignity, and has been regarded as a tacit admission of Anne Boleyn's guilt. Many writers have agreed that it was a point of wisdom in Elizabeth, not to hazard calling attention to the validity of her mother's marriage, or the charges against that unfortunate queen, but inasmuch as it was impossible to prevent those subjects from continuing, as they always had been, points of acrimonious discussion, her cautious evasion of questions so closely touching her own honour, gave rise to the very evils she was so anxious to avoid.

*Pemb.*—And oftentimes excusing of a fault  
 Doth make the fault the worse by the excuse,—  
 As patches set upon a little breach,  
 Discredit more in hiding of a fault,  
 Than did the fault before it was so patch'd.  
 1569.

Pembroke, Arundel, Leicester, Lumley, and many others joined in an effort to bring about an amicable arrangement between Elizabeth and Mary, and for the latter's reinstatement. Froude's *History of England*, 1569.

*Pemb.*—Then (as one that am the tongue of these  
 To sound the purposes of all their hearts),  
 Both for myself and them (but, chief of all,  
 Your safety, for the which myself and them  
 Bend their best studies), heartily request  
 Th' enfranchisement of Arthur ; whose restraint  
 Doth move the murmuring lips of discontent.

\* \* \* \* \*

No. 22.—DATE 1586-7 : THE NEWS OF MARY'S DEATH.  
 Act IV., Scene 2.

Beginning : *K. John.*—Hubert, what news with you ?

Ending : *K. John.*—No certain life achiev'd by other's death



The instant the axe had fallen on Mary, Lord Talbot rode off with fiery speed to Greenwich, where he arrived early on the morning of the 9th February, and communicated the news to Burleigh and his colleagues, who were anxiously awaiting it. Burleigh forbade him to announce it to their royal mistress, saying, "that it would be better for time to be allowed to break it cautiously to her by degrees." Lingard regards this extraordinary proceeding as indicative of a secret collusion between Elizabeth and her premier. . . . In the evening she observed the blaze of bonfires, and asked "why the bells rang out so merrily?" "Because of the death of the Queen of Scots," replied one of the ladies. Elizabeth made no reply.

Miss Strickland's *Life of Mary Stuart*.

[Enter HUBERT.]

K. John.—Hubert, what news with you?

[Speaks apart with him.]

One of the charges against Davison was, that of having broken the Queen's injunctions in having showed the "warrant" to Burleigh, and when Burleigh asked him if she meant it to be executed, with having replied that she did.

Froude's *History of England*, 1586-7.

Pemb.—This is the man should do the bloody deed :

*He showed his warrant to a friend of mine :*

The image of a wicked heinous fault

Lives in his eye ; that close aspect of his

Doth show the mood of a much-troubled breast ;

And I do fearfully believe 'tis done,

*What we so fear'd he had a charge to do.*

\* \* \* \* \*

K. John.—We cannot hold mortality's strong hand :—

Good lords, although my will to give is living,

The suit which you demand is gone and dead ;

He tells us Arthur is deceased to-night.

Pemb.—Indeed, we heard how near his death he was

Before the child himself felt he was sick :

This must be answered either here or hence.

K. John.—Why do you bend such solemn brows on me?

Think you I bear the shears of destiny?

\* \* \* \* \*

The last line is very significant, indicating that the responsibility was with some one else, and the peculiar symbol "shears of destiny," we venture to think, points to Burleigh, whose ancestor was said to have been a tailor.

The line, "*Pemb.* That blood which ow'd the breadth of all this isle, we suggest," refers to Mary's right to Scotland, and England, united.

No. 23.—DATE 1586-7: THE FIVE MOONS.

Act IV., Scene 2.

Beginning: *Hub.*—My lord, they say five moons were seen to-night.

Ending: *Hub.*—Cuts off his tale, and talks of Arthur's death.

Fotheringay, at this agitating crisis, when everything extraordinary however natural, was construed into a portent, the soldiers who kept guard under the windows of the death-doomed Queen on the night of Sunday, January 29th, half an hour after midnight, were startled by the appearance of a large and brilliant meteor, like a flame of fire in the firmament, opposite her bed-chamber window, which returned thrice, to their inexpressible terror, and was not visible in any other quarter of the castle.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1586-7.

On October 8th, Davison, by her Majesty's command, writes to Burleigh, who had gone to Fotheringay, and after giving various instructions, informs him and Walsingham, that he, Davison, is especially commanded by her Majesty to signify to them both how greatly she doth long to hear how her "Spirit" and her "Moon" do find themselves after so foul and wearisome a journey. By the above pet names was the mighty Elizabeth accustomed in moments of playfulness to designate those grave and unbending statesmen. But playfulness at such a season was revolting to every feeling of humanity, when the object of that foul and weary journey, on which Elizabeth's "Spirit" and her "Moon" had departed, is considered.

Miss Strickland's *Life of Elizabeth*, 1586.

*Hub.*—My lord, they say five moons were seen to-night;  
Four fix'd; and the fifth did whirl about,  
The other four in wonderous motion.

*K. John.*—Five Moons!

*Hub.*—Old men and beldams in the streets  
Do prophesy upon it dangerously.

\* \* \* \* \*

I saw a *smith* stand with his hammer thus,

[LEICESTER.

The whilst his iron did on the anvil cool,  
With open mouth swallowing a tailor's news;

[*The news was first brought to BURLEIGH on the morning of the 9th February.*]

Who, with his *shears* and measure in his hand,  
 Standing on slippers (which his nimble haste  
 Had falsely thrust upon contrary feet.)

\*                      \*                      \*                      \*

Another lean, unwashed *artificer*  
 Cuts off his tale, and talks of Arthur's death.

[WALSINGHAM, and the alleged insnaring "plots."]

The "Meteor" seen at Fotheringay probably suggested the simile of the "five moons," and is an apt allusion to Elizabeth's pet name for Walsingham. Implying (as we think) that the other four ministers involved in this tragedy, were equally as merciless. The four primaries being Walsingham, Leicester, Burleigh, and Hatton, while Davison, the fifth, did whirl about the other four in wonderful motion.

No. 24.—DATE 1587: ELIZABETH DISOWNS HER RESPONSIBILITY  
 Act IV., Scene 2.

Beginning: *K. John*.—Why seek'st thou to possess me with these fears?

Ending: *K. John*.—Between my conscience and my cousin's death.

The next morning she heard the truth and sending for Hatton, expressed the most vehement indignation, wept bitterly, and launched into furious threats of vengeance, "against the men who had usurp'd her authority by putting the Queen of Scots to death without her knowledge or consent." Hatton informed his colleagues; all were in consternation and advised their tool Davison, who had undertaken to stand in the gap, to keep out of her sight till her anger should have subsided. Davison took to his chamber under pretence of indisposition; but Elizabeth ordered him to be arrested and sent to the Tower.

*Miss Strickland's Life of Mary Stuart, 1587.*

*K. John*.—Why seek'st thou to possess me with these fears?  
 Why urgest thou so oft young Arthur's death?  
 Thy hand hath murder'd him: I had a mighty cause  
 To wish him dead, but thou had'st none to kill him.

*Hub*.—No had, my lord! why, did you not provoke me?

*K. John*.—It is the curse of kings to be attended  
 By slaves, that take their humours for a warrant  
 To break within the bloody house of life;  
 And, on the winking of authority.



To understand a law ; to know the meaning  
Of dangerous majesty, when, perchance it frowns  
More upon humour than advis'd respect.

*Hub.*—Here is your hand and seal for what I did.

*K. John.*—Oh, when the last account 'twixt heaven and earth  
Is to be made, then shall this hand and seal  
Witness against us to damnation !  
How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds  
Make ill deeds done ! Had'st not thou been by.  
A fellow by the hand of nature mark'd,  
Quoted, and sign'd, to do a deed of shame,  
This murder had not come into my mind ;  
But, taking note of thy abhorr'd aspect  
Finding thee fit for bloody villany,  
Apt, liable to be employ'd in danger,  
I faintly broke with thee of Arthur's death ;  
And thou, to be endear'd to a king  
Made it no conscience to destroy a prince.

*Hub.*—My lord,—

*K. John.*—Had'st thou but shook thy head or made a pause,  
When I spake darkly what I purposed,  
\* \* \* \* \*  
But thou did'st understand me by my signs,  
And did'st in signs again parley with sin ;  
Yea, without stop, did'st let thy heart consent  
And consequently thy rude hand to act  
The deed, which both our tongues held vile to  
name,—  
\* \* \* \* \*  
Nay, in the body of this fleshly land,  
This kingdom, this confine of blood and breath,  
Hostility and civil tumult reigns  
Between my conscience and my *cousin's* death.

No. 25.—DATE 1586-7 : MARY'S DEATH.

Act IV., Scene 3. Arthur's Speech.

*Arth.*—The wall is high, and yet will I leap down :—  
Good ground, be pitiful, and hurt me not !  
There's few, or none, do know me : if they did,  
This ship-boy's semblance hath disguis'd me quite,  
I am afraid ; and yet I'll venture it.  
If I get down, and do not break my limbs,

I'll find a thousand shifts to get away ;  
As good to die and go, as die and stay.

[Leaps down.

Oh, me ! my uncle's spirit is in these stones :—  
Heaven take my soul, and England keep my bones !

[Dies.

The mode of Arthur's death, as described in these lines, is not in agreement with the speeches following, of Salisbury and Pembroke, where the latter says, "All murders past do stand excused in this." The author of the play, we think, desired to conceal the identity of whom he intended to represent.

The last words of Arthur and Mary are in singular agreement.

"Kneeling on the cushion, she repeated in her usual clear, firm voice, 'In te Domine speravi.' In Thee, Lord, have I hoped ; let me never be put to confusion. Being then guided by the executioner to find the block, she bowed her head upon it intrepidly, exclaiming as she did so, 'In manus tuas.' Into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit."

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*, 1586-7.

*Arth.*—Heaven take my soul, —

No. 26.—DATE, 1586-7 : SALISBURY AND PEMBROKE DENOUNCE  
THE EXECUTION, AND VIEW THE REMAINS.

Act IV., Scene 3.

Beginning : *Bast.*—Once more to-day well met, distemper'd  
lords !

Ending : *Pemb.* } Our souls religiously confirm thy words.  
*Big.*

Mr. Secretary Woolley, writing to Leicester, says, "It pleased her majesty yesterday, to call the lords and others of her council before her, into her withdrawing chamber, where she rebuked us all exceedingly for our concealing from her our proceeding in the Queen of Scots' case."

Miss Strickland, *Life of Elizabeth*, 1586-7.

*Bast.*—Once more to-day well met, distemper'd lords !

The King by me requests your presence straight.

"While the tempest of Elizabeth's anger lasted, Burleigh lowered his sails and affected the deepest penitence for having been so unfortunate as to displease her by the zeal for her service ; he humiliated himself by writing the most abject letters that could be desired, and after a time succeeded in re-establishing his wonted ascendancy in the Cabinet."

Miss Strickland, *Life of Elizabeth*, 1586-7.

*Bast.*—Whate'er you think, good words, I think, were best.

The mangled remains of Mary were laid in the hall, and covered with a billiard-table cloth.

Miss Strickland, *Life of Mary Stuart*.

*Sal.*—This is the prison :—what is he lies here ?

[*Seeing Arthur*.

*Mary* was unburied for six months.

*Ibid.*

*Pemb.*—The earth had not a hole to hide this deed.

The writer of Cassell's History of England, 1587, says, " We are now called upon to contemplate one of the most extraordinary scenes in the history of the world. It is that of a woman who, with all the power of a mighty kingdom at her back, has pursued her female relative and neighbouring sovereign to the death with a persevering and undying malice, of which there is no more shocking example."

*Pemb.*—All murders past do stand excus'd in this ;  
And this, *so sole and so unmatchable*.

The same writer, further on, says, " The gross hypocrisy, the intense and unmitigated selfishness, the consciousness of the blackness of the crime she was meditating, and the righteous award of its infamy by all posterity the world over, with the resolve to make others bear the damnable stigma, by tricks and stratagems to which only the most practised criminals could resort, is a spectacle so awful, so astonishing, and so hideous, that we in vain look for its parallel, not merely in the darkest pages of history, but in the all-prolific villainies of fiction."

*Sal.*—Sir Richard, what think you ? Have you beheld,  
Or have you read or heard ? or could you think ?  
Or do you almost think, although you see,  
That you do see ? could thought, without this object ?  
Form such another ? This is the very top,  
The height, the crest, or crest unto the crest,  
Of murder's arms ; this is the bloodiest shame,  
The wildest savagery, the vilest stroke,  
That ever wall-ey'd wrath or staring rage  
Presented to the tears of soft remorse.

No. 27.—DATE 1587 : DAVISON MADE RESPONSIBLE.

Act IV., Scene 3.

Beginning : *Hub.*—Lords, I am hot with haste in seeking you :

Ending : *Bast.*—And Heaven itself doth frown upon the land.



The circumstances connected with the charge against Davison, and his defence, are fully given in Robertson's *History of Scotland*, Froude's *History of England*, also Miss Strickland's *Life of Elizabeth*, 1587, to which we refer.

"His fellow-countrymen, after a strict investigation, exonerated him from all blame."—See Appendix, Robertson's *History of Scotland*.

Walsingham, who saw that the responsibility would certainly be thrown upon someone, feigned illness and got out of the way. The warrant, drawn up by Burleigh, was given to Davison for completion, and after some delay Elizabeth signed it, bidding Davison take it to the Great Seal and to trouble her no more. From the many ominous speeches of the Queen, he was terrified at the gulf, on the edge of which he saw himself standing, and although he had her orders to send off the warrant, he would not do it of himself, which was afterwards done on the joint responsibility of the Council, behind which, Davison fondly hoped, he had sheltered himself. It was a delusion; the Queen, and his more crafty colleagues, made him their scapegoat. He was arrested, committed to the Tower, and, after a form of trial, fined ten thousand pounds, and imprisoned for the rest of his life. The most astonishing part of this affair is that he received considerable sums from the Government, and a pension of one hundred pounds a year, the receipts for which have been found amongst the records so recent as 1839.

*Sal.*—Thou art a murderer.

\*                    \*                    \*                    \*                    \*

*Hub.*—'Tis not an hour since I left him well :  
I honoured him, I lov'd him ; and will weep.  
My date of life out for his sweet life's loss.

\*                    \*                    \*                    \*                    \*

*Bast.*—Here's a good world !—Knew you of this fair work ?  
Beyond the infinite and boundless reach  
Of mercy, if thou did'st this deed of death,  
Art thou damn'd, Hubert.

*Hub.*—Do but hear me, sir :

\*                    \*                    \*                    \*                    \*

*Bast.*—If thou did'st but consent  
To this most cruel act, do but despair ;  
And if thou want'st a cord, the smallest thread  
That ever spider twisted from her womb  
Will serve to strangle thee ; a rush will be a beam  
To hang thee on ; or would'st thou drown thyself,  
Put but a little water in a spoon,

And it shall be as all the ocean,  
 Enough to stifle such a villain up.  
 I do suspect thee very grievously.

*Hub.*—If I in act, consent, or sin of thought,  
 Be guilty of the stealing that sweet breath  
 Which was embounded in this beauteous clay,  
 Let hell want pains enough to torture me!  
 I left him well.

NO. 28.—DATE 1587: ELIZABETH AND SEXTUS V.

Act V., Scene 1.

Beginning: *K. John.*—Thus have I yielded up into your hand  
 The circle of my glory.

Ending: *Pand.*—Take again  
 From this my hand, as holding of the Pope,  
 Your sovereign greatness and authority.

“Surrendering the crown.”

These lines, we think, may be taken metaphorically, viz. that Elizabeth had sacrificed the glory of her reign, by the execution of Mary Stuart.

*K. John.*—Thus have I yielded up into your hand  
 The circle of my glory.

And its restoration, we suggest, was the eulogy on Elizabeth by Pope Sextus V.

This dark chapter of the annals of the maiden monarch closed with the farce of her assuming the office of chief mourner at the funeral of her royal victim, when the mangled remains of Mary Stuart, after being permitted to lie unburied and neglected for six months, were at last interred with regal pomp in Peterborough Cathedral, attended by a train of nobles, and ladies of the highest rank in the English court. The Countess of Bedford acted as Queen Elizabeth's proxy on that occasion, and made the offering in her name.

“What a glorious princess!” exclaimed the sarcastic Pontiff, Sextus V., when the news reached the Vatican. “It is a pity,” he added, “that Elizabeth and I cannot marry, our children would have mastered the whole world.”

Sextus entertained so high an opinion of Elizabeth's regnal talents, that he was accustomed to say, “There were but three sovereigns in Europe who understood the art of governing, namely, himself, the King of Navarre, and the Queen of England.”

Miss Strickland, *Life of Elizabeth*, 1587.

*Pand.*—Take again  
 From this my hand, as holding of the Pope,  
 Your sovereign greatness and authority.

No. 29.—DATE, 1560 : ELIZABETH TEMPORIZES WITH ROME.

Act V., Scene 1.

Beginning : *K. John*.—Now keep your holy word : go meet the French ;

Ending : *Pand*.—Go I to make the French lay down their arms.

Elizabeth, with that astute diplomacy which characterized her whole reign, trimmed her sails at this period so as to bring her within friendly relations with the Pope, whose influence at this moment, if against her, would have augmented her political difficulties, to which the subjoined letter has reference :—

De Quadra, to the Bishop of Arras. June, 1560.

“ I said his Holiness, being a wise prince and a loving father to all his children, could have no object save to give her paternal admonition and advice. I thought perhaps the mission had originated in a suggestion of the King (Philip), our sovereign, who always hoped that a woman so gifted and so wise would find a way to re-unite her subjects with the universal Catholic Church. His Majesty (Philip), I knew, had expressed this conviction to the Pope, *to obviate the designs of the French* ; and the Pope wished to ascertain her real feelings.

“ She was evidently pleased ; she was afraid that his Majesty had withdrawn his support from her at Rome, and a declaration of the Pope against her at this moment she knows would be most unseasonable. For this reason she went on to tell me that she was as good a Catholic as I was. She called God to witness that her belief was the belief of all the Catholics in the realm.”

*Froude's History of England, 1560.*

*K. John*.—Now keep your holy word : go meet the French ;  
And from his Holiness use all your power  
To stop their marches 'fore we are inflaméd.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Pand*.—It was my breath that blew this tempest up,  
Upon your stubborn usage of the Pope ;  
But since you are a *gentle convertite*,  
My tongue shall hush again this storm of war,  
And make fair weather in your blustering land.  
On this Ascension-day remember well,  
Upon your oath of service to the Pope,  
Go I to make the French lay down their arms.



## No. 30.—DATE 1601 : ELIZABETH'S VISIT TO DOVER.

## Act V., Scene I.

Beginning: *Bast.*—All Kent hath yielded ; nothing there holds out.

Ending: *Bast.*—The little number of your doubtful friends.

In this speech of the Bastard's, "All Kent hath yielded," etc., there is a marked difference in tone to the next one, "So, on my soul," etc., and to the one, also, in Scene 2, "By all the blood that ever fury breath'd," both are defiant and resolute, the two latter, we suggest, refer to a much earlier period, and the Dover Castle incident, refers to Elizabeth's visit in 1601, when, having heard that Henry IV. was at Calais, she hoped to induce him to come over and visit her, but he declined the compliment, and sent his minister Rosny, with whom Elizabeth had a very agreeable interview. Henry afterwards sent a grand embassy to his good sister, headed by his troublesome subject Biron, when four hundred noblemen accompanied him, including Count d'Auvergne, the natural son of Charles IX.

The line, "London hath received like a kind host," we suggest, has reference to this incident.

The line, "Your nobles will not hear you, but are gone

To offer service to your enemy,"

may be taken, that her nobles had gone over to her successor, which many had, including Sir Robert Cecil, and her kinsman Sir Robert Carey, thereby enabling James to obtain a great ascendancy in the councils of Elizabeth during the last years of her reign, although the fact was far from being suspected by the declining Queen, even Harrington, dearly as he loved his royal mistress, showed signs and tokens of this worship to the rising sun, when he sent a jewel in the form of a dark lantern, as a new year's gift to James, signifying that the failing lamp of life waxed dim in the declining queen, and would soon be veiled.

Miss Strickland's *Life of Elizabeth*, 1602.

"And wild amazement hurries up and down

The little number of your doubtful friends,"

suggests the idea of a confused state of parties, and of individuals, no one knowing exactly the line of policy to pursue for their best advantage.

## No. 31.—DATE 1559-60 : CECIL URGES ELIZABETH TO ACTION.

## Act V., Scene 1.

Beginning: *Bast.*—So, on my soul, he did, for ought he knew.

Ending: *Bast.*—Our party may well meet a prouder foe.

With these lines we associate the French designs in Scotland, whose ultimate goal was England.

Cecil's conclusion, therefore, was in favour of immediate action, and to this, for a time, he brought Elizabeth to consent. He would pluck safety only from the nettles of danger, steadily he urged it on Elizabeth, whose constitutional irresolution shifted to and fro under alternate pressure, her conviction went with Cecil, but the weight of advice on the other side far preponderated, and the responsibility of choice was terrible, but her braver nature rallied again, her own nobler qualities which danger raised to their due pre-eminence, brought her to Cecil's views, and orders went to Gresham, to borrow, not one, but two hundred thousand pounds. Guns, pistols, and powder barrels were sent over faster than ever, and the young Admiral, Sir William Winter, was ordered to the Forth. A small convoy to Berwick was made the excuse, but his orders were to watch and frustrate the French movements. "He might provoke a quarrel if he did not find one," and if challenged, he was to say that he was acting on his own responsibility. But were he to have lost an action, and to be taken prisoner under such conditions, he would have made himself liable to be hanged as a pirate. But Elizabeth expected these minor sacrifices from her subjects.

*Froude's History of England, 1559-60.*

*Bast.*—But wherefore do you droop? why look you sad?  
Be great in act, as you have been in thought;  
Let not the world see fear and sad distrust.

\* \* \* \* \*

What! shall they seek the lion in his den,  
And fright him there? and make him tremble there?  
Oh, let it not be said!—Forage, and run  
To meet displeasure farther from the doors,  
And grapple with him ere he come so nigh.

*K. John.*—The legate of the Pope hath been with me.

[*ELIZABETH'S advances to Rome.*

\* \* \* \* \*

*Bast.*— Oh, inglorious league!  
Shall we, upon the footing of our land,  
Send fair-play orders, and make compromise,  
Insinuation, parley, and base truce,  
To arms invasive? shall a beardless boy,  
A cocker'd silken wanton, brave our fields,  
And flesh his spirit in a warlike soil,  
Mocking the air with colours idly spread,  
And find no check? Let us, my liege, to arms;

Perchance, the Cardinal cannot make you peace  
Or if he do, let it at least be said,  
They saw we had a purpose of defence.

*K. John.*—Have thou the ordering of this present time.

No. 32.—DATE 1560: LORD MONTAGUE'S DISAFFECTION.

Act V., Scene 2.

Beginning: *Lew.*—My Lord Melun, let this be copied out.

Ending: *Lew.*—What lusty trumpet thus doth summon us?

Both France and England now turned to Spain. On the part of Elizabeth, Sir Thomas Chamberlain and Lord Montague were despatched on a special embassy to Madrid, Montague was selected as the one Catholic nobleman who had opposed every one of Elizabeth's reforming measures, and therefore would be the most welcome to Philip; Chamberlain went as a check upon his companion, and—in Montague's own opinion—as a spy upon him. There was perhaps a secret reason for a choice from which so much danger was to be feared; the Queen may have desired that in the event of a rising of the Catholics their principal leader should be out of the way.

*Froude's History of England, 1560.*

In 1562, Borghese, a servant of the Bishop de Quadra, made to Cecil, a complete revelation of every secret that he, Borghese, knew, which implicated chiefly, Lord Montague (the Salisbury of the play), the Earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland.

*Sal.*—Upon our sides it never shall be broken,  
And, noble Dauphin, albeit we swear  
A voluntary zeal and unurg'd faith  
To your proceedings; yet, believe me, prince,  
I am not glad that such a sore of time  
Should seek a plaster by contemn'd revolt  
And heal the inveterate canker of one wound  
By making many. . . .

\* \* \* \* \*

But such is the infection of the time,  
That, for the health and physic of our right,  
We cannot deal but with the very hand  
Of stern injustice and confused wrong.

*Lew.*—A noble temper dost thou show in this;  
And great affections wrestling in thy bosom  
Do make an earthquake of nobility.

\* \* \* \* \*



Come, come ; for thou shalt thrust thy hand as deep  
 Into the purse of rich prosperity  
 As Lewis himself : . . . .

\* \* \* \* \*

Look, where the holy legate comes apace  
 To give us warrant from the hand of heaven,  
 And on our actions set the name of right  
 With holy breath.

*Pand.*—Hail, noble prince of France !  
 The next is this,—King John hath reconcil'd  
 Himself to Rome ; his spirit is come in,  
 That so stood out against the holy church.

\* \* \* \* \*

Pandulph's speech has a reference to Elizabeth's advances to Rome, see De Quadra's letter, paper No. 29.

No. 33.—DATE 1560 : ELIZABETH DEFIANT.

Act V., Scene 2.

Beginning : *Bast.*—According to the fair-play of the world.

Ending : *Bast.*—And thou shalt find it, Dauphin, do not doubt.

In England, all the world was mustering, drilling, and practising. Elizabeth, herself, on a Neapolitan courser, exercised every day with the train bands in St. James's Park ; and even De Quadra could not withhold his sarcastic admiration from her.

*Bast.*—For your own ladies and pale-visag'd maids,  
 Like Amazons, come tripping after drums,—  
 Their thimbles into armed gauntlets change,  
 Their needs to lances, and their gentle hearts  
 To fierce and bloody inclination.

So the world drove forward, the horizon growing every moment darker, yet the form in which the storm would break was still uncertain. Sir George Howard, on arriving in London, found Elizabeth ready to fight all Europe, in the cause which she had undertaken.

De Sevre, who was charged with a message from the French Government, waited on Elizabeth. She was in one of her violent humours, and threw off all concealment, once more going over the weary ground of the Queen of Scots' misdoings, then bursting out, she said, you complain of the fleet and army which we have sent to Scotland, what were we to do? Have we forgotten, think you, your treachery at Ambletue, when our brother was king? You challenge our crown ; you deny our right to be

Queen, you snatch the pretext of a rebellion to collect your armies on our borders, and you expect us to sit still like children, you complain that we sent our fleet to intercept your reinforcements; It is true we did so, and the fleet has done its work; and what then? We know what was intended for ourselves, and we have forborne long enough. We mean nothing against your mistress's lawful right, but events must take their course.

*Froude's History of England, 1560.*

*Bast.*—By all the blood that ever fury breath'd,  
The youth says well.—Now hear our English king;  
For thus his royalty doth speak in me.  
He is preparéd; and reason too he should:  
This apish and unmannerly approach  
This harness'd mask and unadvised revel,  
This unhair'd sauciness and boyish troops,  
The king doth smile at: and is well preparéd  
To whip this dwarfish war, these pigmy arms,  
From out the circle of his territories,  
That hand which had the strength, even at your door,  
To cudgel you, and make you take the hatch;

\* \* \* \* \*

To hug with swine; to seek sweet safety out  
In vaults and prisons; and to thrill and shake  
Even at the crying of your nation's crow,  
Thinking this voice an armed Englishman;  
Shall that victorious hand be feeble here,  
That in your chambers gave you chastisement?  
No! know the gallant monarch is in arms;  
And, like an eagle o'er his aiery, towers,  
To souse annoyance that comes near his nest.

\* \* \* \* \*

No. 34.—DATE 1560 to 1603.

Act V., with a few "intermediates" interwoven, begins and ends Elizabeth's reign.

Scene 1. Represents the hopes entertained by the Pope, of a reconciliation with Elizabeth, and it also represents Cecil's policy.

Scene 2. Is taken up with all that is important in regard to the affairs of the French in Scotland 1560.

Scene 3. We find intermingling with the end. The nonsuccess of the English troops at Leith, and the first signs of Elizabeth's declining health.

The lines, "Be of good comfort; for the great supply,  
 That was expected by the Dauphin here,  
 Are wreck'd three nights ago on Goodwin Sands,  
 This news was brought to Richard but even now:  
 The French fight coldly, and retire themselves,"

we suggest, have reference to D'Elbouf's reinforcements, "are wreck'd" we think infers this.

"D'Elbouf, less fortunate, was caught at sea by the tempest. In all directions the storm must have blown; half the fleet was dashed in pieces on the Holland flats—sailors, troops, horses, all perishing, some vessels foundered at sea and the drowned bodies were washed up upon the Norfolk coast. In one day and night, the laborious preparations of the autumn were annihilated."

*Froude's History of England, 1560.*

Scene 4. The most important feature is, "Melun's" betrayal to Salisbury of the French designs.

Monluc, Bishop of Valence (whom we take to be "Melun" of the play) was intrusted with a mission from the French Government, to England, and Scotland, but he played a very unsatisfactory part, he created distrust in the minds of the English, against the French, and Scotch, also in the minds of the Scotch, against their own Queen, and against the English.

Scene 5. Is the finishing up of the French affairs in Scotland.

No. 35.—DATE 1560: CECIL AND THE TREATY OF LEITH.

Act V., Scene 6. For the most part is a gathering in of the "ends," the principal feature of which is, the speech of the Bastard, and has reference to the "Treaty of Leith." The first line represents Elizabeth's dissatisfaction:—

*Bast.*—Withhold thine indignation, mighty Heaven,  
 And tempt us not to bear above our power!—  
 I'll tell thee, Hubert, half my power this night,  
 Passing these flats, are taken by the tide,—  
 These Lincoln washes have devoured them,  
 Myself, well-mounted, hardly have escap'd  
 Away, before! Conduct me to the King:  
 I doubt he will be dead or ere I come.

If Cecil hoped for gratitude on his return to the court, his expectations deceived him. Clinton and Pembroke might express their private satisfaction; the Duke of Norfolk might think the "agreement" so happy for England, that the Queen could not have bought it too dearly; he might wish that those who

quarrelled with it might do their country as good service ; but the Queen had set her heart on a more substantial result for the money which she had laid out.

The favourites of the palace who hated Cecil, and had objects of their own, at which they could not arrive, except by Cecil's fall, persuaded her that she might have covered herself with glory, and extorted the surrender of Calais. . . . She quarrelled with conditions which far exceeded her recent anticipations, and resented the close of a war which she had so unwillingly consented to undertake.

Froude's *History of England*, 1560.

Cecil, who was held in such high favour by the Queen, is made to say :

“ Myself, well-mounted, hardly have escap'd.”

No. 36.—DATE 1607 : SIR FRANCIS BACON ADVOCATES A DIGEST  
OF THE LAWS.

Act V., Scene 7.

Salisbury's speech.—Be of good comfort, Prince. . . .

Sir Francis Bacon, on March 28th, 1607, speaking in the House of Commons on the benefits that would follow a union of the laws between England and Scotland, he observed that the means to the work would be as excellent as the work itself, “ for if both laws shall be united, it is of necessity for preparation and inducement thereunto that our own laws be reviewed and recompiled : than the which I think there cannot be a work that his majesty can undertake in these times of peace, more politic, more honourable, nor more beneficial to his subjects in all ages. . . . For this continual heaping up of the laws without digesting them, maketh but a chaos and confusion, and turneth the laws many times to become but snares for the people,” etc.

On the 28th July, 1608, in a sheet of private memoranda concerning “ policy,” we find these :

“ Persuade the King in glory, Aurea condet soccula ” ;

“ New laws to be compounded and collected : law-giver, perpetus, princeps.”

Spedding's *Life of Bacon*.

*Sal.*—Be of good comfort, prince, for you are born  
To set a form upon that indigest,  
Which he hath left so shapeless and so rude.



## No. 37.—DATE 1603 : ELIZABETH'S DEATH.

Act V., Scene 7.

Beginning : *P. Hen.* It is too late : The life of all his blood  
Is touch'd corruptibly ;

Ending : The scene.

Miss Strickland, in her life of Elizabeth, says : " Though she became not suddenly sick yet she daily decreased of her rest and feeding, and within fifteen days, continues Lady Southwell, ' she felt down right ill,' "and the cause being wondered at by Lady Scrope, with whom she was very private and confidant, being her near kinswoman, her Majesty told her (commanding her to conceal the same) that she saw one night her own body exceedingly lean and fearful, in a light of fire."

*K. John.*—I am a scribbled form, drawn with a pen  
Upon a parchment ; and against this fire  
Do I shrink up.

On the 14th January, the Queen having sickened two days before of a cold, removed to Richmond, which she said, was the warm winter box to shelter her old age.

*Pemb.*—His Highness yet doth speak ; and holds belief  
That being brought into the open air  
It would allay the burning quality  
Of that fell poison which assaileth him.

*P. Hen.*—Let him be brought into the orchard here.

" The Lord Admiral was sent for, as the person who possessed the most influence with the Queen ; he was one of her nearest surviving kinsmen. He came and knelt beside her, where she sat among her cushions, sullen and unresigned, he kissed her hands with tears, and implored her to take a little nourishment, after much ado, he prevailed so far that she received a little broth from his hands, he feeding her with a spoon, but when he urged her to go to bed, she angrily refused, and then, in wild and wandering words, hinted at phantasma that had troubled her midnight couch. If he were in the habit of seeing such things in his bed, she said, as she did in hers, he would not persuade her to go there."

*P. Hen.*—It is too late : the life of all his blood  
Is touch'd corruptibly ; and his pure brain  
(Which some suppose the soul's frail dwelling house)  
Doth by the idle comments that it makes,  
Foretell the ending of mortality.

Some attempt appears to have been made to charm away the dark spirit that had come over the Queen, by the power of melody at this dread crisis, for Beaumont says, "this morning the Queen's music has gone to her." He sarcastically adds, "I believe she means to die as gaily as she has lived."

*Pem.*—He is more patient  
Than when you left him ; even now he sung.

*P. Hen.*—Oh, vanity of sickness ! fierce extremes  
In their continuance will not feel themselves.  
Death, having prey'd upon the outward parts,  
Leaves them insensible ; and his siege is now  
Against the mind, the which he pricks and wounds  
With many legions of strange fantasies,  
Which in their throng and press to that last hold,  
Confound themselves. 'Tis strange that death should  
sing.  
I am the cygnet to this pale faint swan,  
Who chants a doleful hymn to his own death,  
And from the organ-pipe of frailty sings  
His soul and body to their lasting rest.

"On the 19th March, De Beaumont informs the King his master, that the Queen had been very much indisposed for the last fourteen days, having scarcely slept at all during that period, and eaten much less than usual, being seized with such a restlessness, that though she had no decided fever, she felt a great heat in her stomach, and a continued thirst which obliged her every moment to take something to abate it."

"The Queen," writes Beaumont, "had been somewhat better the day before, but grew worse again, and so full of chagrin and weary of life, that notwithstanding all entreaties of her councillors and physicians for her to take the proper medicine and means for her relief, she refused everything."

*K. John.*—Poison'd,—ill fare ;—dead, forsooth, cast off :  
And none of you will bid the winter come,  
To thrust his icy fingers in my maw ;  
Nor let my kingdom's rivers take their course  
Through my burn'd bosom ; nor entreat the north  
To make his bleak winds kiss my parched lips,  
And comfort me with cold :—I do not ask you  
much,  
I beg cold comfort ; and you are so strait,  
And so ingrateful, you deny me that,

Lord Admiral Howard, to whom, as her near relation and fast friend through life, she was confidential to the last, ever regarding those unreal phantasma which, when her great mind awoke for a moment, it is plain she referred to their proper causes. When Cecil and his colleagues were gone, the Queen, shaking her head piteously, said to her brave kinsman, "My Lord, I am tied with a chain of iron about my neck." The Lord Admiral reminded her of her wonted courage, but she replied despondingly, "I am tied, I am tied, and the case is altered with me." The Queen understood that Secretary Cecil had given forth to the people that she was mad.

*K. John.*—Oh, cousin, thou art come to set mine eye :  
The tackle of my heart is crack'd and burn'd  
And all the shrouds, wherewith my life should sail,  
Are turned to one thread, one little hair.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, who assisted her last moments with his consolations, continued long in prayer, and when he thought to leave her, the Queen made a sign with her hand, that he should continue to pray. Elizabeth, speechless, agonizing, and aware of the utter inefficiency of the aid of the physician or nurse, was eager for spiritual medicine. She had tasted in the dark hour, of the waters of life, and the thirst of the immortal spirit was not lightly satisfied. She made a second time a sign to have the Archbishop continue in prayer. He did so with earnest cries to God for her soul's health. The Queen to all our sight much rejoiced thereat, continues an eye-witness to this impressive scene.

*K. John.*—My heart hath one poor string to stay it by,  
Which holds but till thy news be utterèd  
And then all this thou see'st is but a clod,  
And model of confounded royalty.

By this, it grew late and everyone departed, all but the women who attended her.

The spirit of the mighty Elizabeth, after all, passed away so quietly that the vigilance of the self-interested spies by whom she was surrounded, was baffled, and no one knew the moment of her departure. Exhausted by her devotions, she had after the Archbishop left her, sunk into a deep sleep from which she never awoke, and about three in the morning it was discovered that she had ceased to breathe.

Unsuspected by the Bastard, King John dies, while the former was speaking.



*Sal.*—You breathe these dead news in as dead an ear,—  
My liege! My lord! but now a king,—now thus.

*P. Hen.*—Even so must I run on, and even so stop,  
What surety of the world, what hope, what stay,  
When this was now a king, and now is clay?

*Bast.*—Art thou gone so?

The last four lines of the play, embody the ideas of Lord Keeper Bacon, who, in a confidential letter to Cecil, on the affairs of Scotland and England, said, Scotland and England united, might encounter the world in arms.

Froude's *History of England*, 1570.

Now these, her princes, are come home again,  
Come the three corners of the world in arms,  
And we shall shock them: nought shall make us rue,  
If England to itself do rest but true.

## THE RENAISSANCE.

IT becomes daily more important that a particular inquiry should be made into the history, characteristics, and aims of the "Second Renaissance." The Italian revival of learning, which took place during the life of Dante, we account the "First Renaissance." It was a revival chiefly of classical literature, in the original, and hence a revival of learning *for the learned only*. Was the "Second Renaissance," the TEMPORIS PARTUS MAS-  
CULUS, the "New Birth of Time" from which Francis Bacon had such mighty expectations? Should space be afforded for a paper on this subject, it may be inserted in the next number. Meanwhile it is well to guide readers to the observation of facts which point to the conclusion that this *Second Renaissance* was intimately, though secretly, connected with Sir Nicholas Bacon, his sons Anthony and Francis, and their friends. Also that the histories of Freemasonry in its lowest or craft degrees, as well as of the highest and most secret degrees of the Rosy Cross, are so far as we can discover inextricably interwoven with the true history of the *Second Renaissance*.

Books which treat of this subject stop short, or become hazy, so soon as we reach the Baconian Epoch. The work of Sir



Nicholas and Francis Bacon is practically ignored, yet in tracing to their sources the histories of paper-making, printing, engraving, designing, of symbolic and hieroglyphic wood cuts, we find ourselves for ever returning to the same centre—the *Bacon family*; and as the very pivot and axis of the whole, to Francis Bacon himself. He seems to have been, if not the founder, or the father of the *Second Renaissance*, yet the most gifted, energetic, and self-sacrificing of her sons.

This circumstance, if proved to be a fact, is sufficient to explain all the present great mysteries and difficulties which surround the history of Sir Nicholas and his two distinguished sons. It explains the obstructions placed in the path of the seeker after accurate information as to the beginnings of paper-making, printing, and kindred crafts, from about 1520 to the present day. It gives a very good hint as to the influence of the Freemason Society in connection with these difficulties and obstructions, and of the existence of semi-secret, or guarded collections of MSS. and books in certain great libraries, of secret marks introduced into books even in the present day.

If Francis Bacon were indeed the centre of the *Second Renaissance*, a marvel, greater than any of the former, is explained; the marvel, namely, that in the days "dark and dangerous," when, according to his reiterated and uncontradicted assertions, all elements, ingredients, and ornaments of an elegant or fine style of writing were "deficient," the literature of the 16th century suddenly burst into full bloom, not alone in England, but simultaneously in France, Germany and Holland, in Spain and Italy.

---

